

## USDA FOREST SERVICE

### REVISED FY 2000 and FY 2001 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN

Since the passage of the Organic Act in 1897, the Forest Service continues to provide leadership in the management, protection, and use of the Nation's forest, rangeland and aquatic ecosystems. Today's National Forest System encompasses over 192 million acres located in 44 states, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Through its research organization, the Forest Service remains a world leader in the discovery of solutions to natural resource related challenges in areas ranging from urban and tropical forestry to recreation management and forest product utilization. The State and Private Forestry organization works with State, local and tribal governments and private landowners to help maintain and improve the health and productivity of the Nation's urban and rural forests and related economies.

While the Forest Service's involvement in the conservation and wise use of natural resources remains a constant, the environmental legislation of the last 30 years has significantly changed the way the agency operates. Recent policy decisions, such as the Natural Resource Agenda, reflect a renewed commitment to managing healthy ecosystems. Other legislation strengthens the Forest Service's ability to provide technical, financial, and economic assistance to State and private landowners and other countries. The agency's mission and strategic goals are primarily derived from the following laws:

*Organic Act of 1897:* specifies the purposes (i.e., timber and water supply) for which forest reserves can be established and provides for their protection and management.

*Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960:* directs that the national forests be managed for multiple uses including recreation, range, timber, watershed, wildlife and fish, and a sustained yield of products and services.

*Wilderness Act of 1964:* creates the National Wilderness Preservation system, and protects the natural characteristics of lands designated as wilderness.

*Clean Water Amendments Act of 1972:* establishes a policy to restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the Nation's waters.

*Endangered Species Act of 1973:* sets the policy for conserving species and the critical habitat of fish, wildlife and plants that are in danger of or threatened with extinction.

*National Forest Management Act of 1976:* provides guidelines for planning and management on national forests and specifies information and analytical requirements for specific resources.

*Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976:* provides direction on the planning and designation of land uses through a coordinated planning process, on Congressional authority to withdraw and otherwise designate lands, and policy on receipt of fair market value for use of public land and resources.

*Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978, as amended:* authorizes cooperation and assistance to non-Federal forest landowners in forest management, timber production, insect and disease control, urban and community forestry, and fire prevention.

*Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978:* authorizes the agency to conduct and cooperate in research to generate knowledge about protecting, managing, and using forested and rangeland renewable resources.

*International Forestry Cooperation Act of 1990:* authorizes the agency to work overseas and to provide technical and financial assistance for international cooperative activities and research.

*Government Performance and Results Act of 1993:* directs the agency to prepare and periodically revise Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans, both focusing on outcomes and results.

### **MISSION**

*To sustain the health, productivity and diversity of the land to meet the needs of present and future generations.* The phrase "Caring for the Land and Serving People" expresses the spirit of this mission. Conserving and restoring the health of the land is the principle underlying every Forest Service program:

Healthy land is fundamental to human well-being and to providing a sustainable flow of goods and services. This approach to management, where goods and services are provided within the capability of the resource base, is referred to as an "ecosystem approach" to land and water management or, more succinctly, ecosystem management.

Ecosystem management considers ecological, economic and social factors in determining how to best maintain and enhance the quality of the environment to meet current and future needs for recreation, water, timber, minerals, fish, wildlife, and wilderness on national forest lands. It also involves collaboration with partners ranging from other Federal land management agencies to private individuals and groups in urban and rural areas across the country. Domestically and internationally, activities will be directed at developing values, products and services in such a way as to maintain ecosystem health. The agency will continue to develop and use the best available scientific information to facilitate achievement of our goals and objectives.

### **STRATEGIC PLAN REVISION EFFORTS**

A draft revised Strategic Plan is currently undergoing public review and is scheduled for completion in September 2000. While its broader strategic direction remains fundamentally similar, the draft 2000 Revision focuses on outcomes or results to be achieved over a period of time. Associated with each goal are objectives, strategies to achieve the objectives, and measures of progress. These quantifiable measures of progress are absent from the existing Strategic and Performance Plans. As a result, the Forest Service has not been able to objectively evaluate the contribution of its annual accomplishments, as defined by the annual performance goals and measures, towards achieving either the strategic long-term goals or objectives.

The revised Strategic Plan, once adopted, will likely result in extensive changes to the Forest Service annual performance plan for FY 2001/2002. Because the proposed draft revision might change as a result of public comments, it is premature to incorporate the goals, objectives and associated milestones from the draft Strategic Plan in this version of the FY 2000/2001 Performance Plan. However, while not extensive, some changes have been made to this version of the Performance Plan. These changes include combining certain objectives and revising the annual performance indicators within the objectives. These changes move the Plan in the direction of the draft revised Strategic Plan. Specific changes to the objectives are outlined in Appendix E.

### **THE FOREST SERVICE NATURAL RESOURCE AGENDA**

Presented in March 1998, the USDA Forest Service Natural Resource Agenda encompasses many of the critical issues facing us today and sets priorities for addressing these concerns. The Natural Resource Agenda focuses on four key emphasis areas and is being used to direct shifts in budget and policy and to align resources with the work that needs to be done. The four emphasis areas in the Natural Resource Agenda as follows:

- Watershed Health and Restoration
- Sustainable Forest Management
- National Forest Road System
- Recreation

Watershed protection is one of the primary reasons the National Forest System (NFS) lands were created. While our Nation's forests and watersheds are basically healthy when viewed on a national scale, regional and local areas affected by the invasion of exotic plants and animals, fuel buildup, and other natural and human-caused factors are still of great concern.

The Natural Resource Agenda addresses the USDA Forest Service commitment to sustainable forest management. Major challenges include integrating environmental, social, and economic considerations and measuring progress toward achieving sustainability.

The road system on NFS lands is extensive, diverse, and vital for public use and active management. The Natural Resource Agenda focuses on meeting the access needs of our customers by providing a road system that is safe and affordable, with minimal ecological impact.

The NFS lands provide the greatest public supply of outdoor recreation opportunities in America. By focusing on recreation, the Natural Resource Agenda addresses our challenges to promote excellence in customer service, partnerships, and forest and community health within the capability of the land for the benefit of all Americans.

## **ORGANIZATION**

To accomplish its mission, the Forest Service employs about 36,000 people. In the National Forest System, the agency manages about 192 million acres of public land that is administered through 155 National Forests and 20 National Grasslands. State and Private Forestry provides technical and financial support to non-Federal forest landowners, including private landowners, communities, State forestry agencies, and tribal governments and assists them in protecting their lands from fire, insects, disease and noxious weeds; in forest health monitoring; and in managing their lands. Through cooperation with other research agencies and universities, Forest Service Research provides the scientific foundation for sustainable forest management and the information and technology needed to assure the health, diversity, and productivity of forest and rangeland ecosystems.

## **BUDGET PRIORITIES**

Preliminary cost estimates for achieving the FY 2001 component of the strategic plan's goals and related objectives are included in this performance plan. These costs were developed using a crosswalk that links the strategic goals and objectives with the agency's budget structure. Applying this crosswalk to the FY 2001 President's budget level results in the following distribution of total budgetary costs among the performance plan's 18 objectives.

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Funding \$ in thousands</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1.1 Ensure Healthy and Diverse Aquatic Ecosystems	\$276,291	7.3%
1.2 Ensure Healthy and Diverse Forests and Rangelands	1,560,865	41.2%
1.3 Increase the Amount of Habitat Supporting Viable Populations of Native Species.	49,199	1.3%
1.4 Develop Scientific and Management Information to Support Sustainable Ecosystem Management	350,862	9.3%
1.5 Protect Natural Wilderness Ecosystem Related Values	12,799	0.3%
<b>Goal 1: Ensure Sustainable Ecosystems</b>	<b>\$2,250,016</b>	<b>59.3%</b>
2.1 Provide Quality Recreation Experiences	\$527,221	13.9%
2.2 Support Improved Urban Environments	39,471	1.0%
2.3 Support Healthy and Diverse Rural Communities	257,340	6.8%
2.4 Provide for Sustainable Yield of Goods and Services	263,021	6.9%
2.5 Develop Scientific and Management Information to Support Improved Natural Resource Management and Use	177,364	4.7%
2.6 Provide a Safe Environment for the Public and Employees on National Forest System Lands	74,518	2.0%
2.7 Provide for Special Uses and Protect National Forest System Land Title	60,440	1.6%
2.8 Provide for Safe Infrastructure and Access to National Forest System Lands	142,503	3.8%
<b>Goal 2: Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems</b>	<b>\$1,541,878</b>	<b>40.7%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,791,894</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Total budgetary costs include both discretionary and mandatory appropriations. See Appendix A, Summary of Agency Resources, for a detailed breakdown of these figures. The management initiatives in Goal 3 (Ensure Organizational Effectiveness) are not included in the above distribution. Instead they

are funded by those programs and appropriations in the other two goals, which logically contribute to the accomplishment of Goal 3. As the agency refines its cost estimates and implements its priorities, future funding distributions may vary from those displayed above.

**Goal 1:** Ensure Sustainable Ecosystems.

**Objective 1.1:** Healthy, biologically diverse and resilient aquatic ecosystems restored and protected to maintain a variety of ecological conditions and benefits.

**Program Activities:** State and Private Forestry (S&PF), National Forest System (NFS), Public Asset Protection, Land Acquisition, and Cooperative Work - Trust Funds. Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 data reflect fund realignment resulting from implementation of the primary purpose principle and a revised budget structure. Comparable data for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 are not available at this time.

	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimate	FY 2001 Estimate
<b>Funding (in thousands of dollars)</b>	NA	NA	\$276,801	\$276,291
<b>FTEs</b>	NA	NA	2,735	2,672

<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS <sup>1/</sup></b>	<b>FY 1998 Actual</b>	<b>FY 1999 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2000 Target</b>	<b>FY 2001 Target</b>
Improve and protect wetland, riparian, and aquatic functions, processes, and associated values by restoring impaired soil and water conditions and improving inland and anadromous fish habitat in unsatisfactory condition				
Land Treatments to Protect and Improve Watershed Conditions on NFS Lands (acres treated) <sup>2/</sup>	38,497	35,562	26,608	25,233
Roads decommissioned (miles) <sup>3/</sup>	2,099	2,907	2,500	2,500

<sup>1/</sup> Data sources include Annual Reports of the Forest Service (FYs 1995-98); final Management Attainment Reports (MAR) for FYs 1995-99; Planning and Budget Advice; and field estimates.

<sup>2/</sup> Formerly titled "Soil and Water Resource Improvements – Lands Restored or Enhanced"

<sup>3/</sup> Formerly titled "Road Decommissioning and Stabilization"

**Discussion of Performance Goals:** Achievement of the annual performance targets displayed in the table above supports the accomplishment of USDA's Strategic Plan Goal 3.2: *Promote sustainable management of public lands; protect and restore critical forestland, rangeland, wilderness and aquatic ecosystems.* The annual performance indicators are defined in Appendix B.

Restoration of National Forest System lakes and streams improves aquatic and riparian ecosystems in the immediate project area as well as downstream. Runoff control structures and reshaped and revegetated areas help improve water quality, control erosion, and generally result in healthier, more diverse aquatic ecosystems. Decommissioning and stabilization of selected National Forest System roads also benefits aquatic ecosystems by reducing normal road sediment while lowering the risk of road failures that could deliver excessive sediments to stream courses.

Other indicators, reported under objective 1.2, contribute to this objective as well. These include land acquisition, the number of non-industrial private forestland (NIPF) acres covered under approved Stewardship Management Plans, and the number of NIPF acres on which multi-resource practices are being performed.

**Means and Strategies:** Aquatic ecosystem restoration and protection efforts remain a top priority in FY 2001. Along with land treatment and road decommission activities, several other programs are essential to this effort as well. For example, while not reflected in the annual performance measures, hazardous materials (HAZMAT) site cleanup and abandoned mine land reclamation restores land and water

resources to healthy conditions. Responding to hazardous substance sites and abandoned mine land reclamation efforts will continue to be emphasized in FY 2001.

External factors affect the ability to protect and restore aquatic ecosystems. Major storms, catastrophic fires, and other natural events can significantly alter aquatic ecosystem health. In some cases, the effects of natural events can be mitigated. For example, prescribed fire reduces fuel loadings, which, in turn, lessens the intensity of wildfires if they occur. Establishing adequate vegetation in riparian zones reduces the damage caused by flooding.

In addition to natural events, other factors affect the Forest Service's ability to accomplish annual performance targets. For example, public resistance to road closures and obliteration proposals at the local level affects our ability to meet targets for road decommissioning. This resistance can be addressed through local public involvement in road closure decisions, which often leads to improved understanding of the need for road decommissioning and ultimately helps the agency accomplish its goals.

The Forest Service relies on key partnerships and crosscutting interagency efforts, including most Federal natural resource management agencies such as the BLM, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, and EPA.

**Verification and Validation:** Refer to Appendix C for a general description of Forest Service reporting systems and management and activity reviews.

**Goal 1:** Ensure Sustainable Ecosystems.

**Objective 1.2:** Ecological integrity of forested and rangeland ecosystems restored or protected to maintain biological and physical components, functions and interrelationships, and the capability for self-renewal.

**Program Activities:** State and Private Forestry (S&PF), National Forest System (NFS), Wildland Fire Management, Land Acquisition, Permanent Appropriations and Cooperative Work - Trust Funds. Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 data reflect fund realignment resulting from implementation of the primary purpose principle and a revised budget structure. Comparable data for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 are not available at this time.

	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimate	FY 2001 Estimate
<b>Funding (in thousands of dollars)</b>	NA	NA	\$1,371,160	\$1,560,865
<b>FTEs</b>	NA	NA	14,020	13,564

<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/</b>	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Target	FY 2001 Target
Restore forested lands identified as needing restoration, use a variety of treatments to maintain, improve and restore forested lands to ensure ecological integrity, and aggressively treat noxious weed infestations that pose a threat to rangeland health				
Lands Restored by Reforestation	287,905	267,013	234,503	220,304
Treatment of harvest related woody fuels - brush disposal (acres)	115,503	108,896	107,200	110,035
Land Treatments to Protect and Restore Forest and Grassland Ecosystems on NFS Lands (acres treated)				
- Noxious Weed Treatments	75,138	87,000	56,000	85,000
- Rangelands Restored and Protected	NA	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
- Timber sales	525,755	448,746	520,000	448,500

PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS <u>1/</u>	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Target	FY 2001 Target
Forestlands maintained or enhanced by stand improvement	296,951	262,786	235,365	224,505
Hazardous fuels reduction (acres)	1,489,293	1,412,281	1,320,000	1,345,000
Firefighter production capability (% of most efficient level)	NA	69	74	72
Land ownership consolidated through acquisition and exchange to facilitate restoration and protection (acres) <u>2/</u>	177,513	488,835	116,550	100,906
The Forest Service will encourage restoration efforts on non-industrial private forest (NIPF) lands through Stewardship Management Plans, Stewardship practices, and watershed restoration activities				
NIPF lands under approved Stewardship Management Plans (acres) <u>3/</u>	1,158,772	1,866,000	1,905,000	1,773,000
Multiresource practices implemented on NIPF lands (acres) <u>4/</u>	125,000	0	0	53,185
Legacy Project Acquisition (acres)	NA	19,281	157,632	183,112
Forest health surveys and evaluations, Federal and Cooperative lands (million acres)	787.5	788.0	788.0	788.0

1/ Sources include Annual Reports of the Forest Service (FYs 1995-98); final Management Attainment Reports (MAR) for FYs 1995-99; Planning and Budget Advice; and field estimates.

2/ Annual accomplishments also contribute to accomplishment of Objective 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 and 2.4. Represents a combination of all land acquisition acres.

3/ The majority of the Forest Stewardship program's annual accomplishments and their associated benefits accrue to objective 1.2. Benefits from this program also contribute to the accomplishment of objective 1.1, 2.1, and 2.4. To avoid confusion, the total annual performance goal is displayed here under objective 1.2. However, the funding associated with this program, displayed in the table above, is distributed among the four objectives.

4/ The majority of the Stewardship Incentive program's annual accomplishments and their associated benefits accrue to objective 1.2. Benefits from this program also contribute to the accomplishment of objective 1.1, 2.3, and 2.4. To avoid confusion, the total annual performance goal is displayed here under objective 1.2. However, the funding associated with this program, displayed in the table above, is distributed among the four objectives.

**Discussion of Annual Performance Goals:** Achievement of the annual performance targets supports the accomplishment of USDA's Strategic Plan Goal 3.2: *Promote sustainable management of public lands; protect and restore critical forestland, rangeland, wilderness and aquatic ecosystems.* These indicators are described in detail in Appendix B.

Forest health surveys and evaluations generate important information on both federal and cooperative lands. This information allows treatment priorities to be refined to address critical needs, such as reducing build-up of fuels on NFS and private lands, reducing insect, disease and invasive species threats, replanting and improving forest stands, and preventing soil erosion.

The 9.9 million non-industrial private forest (NIPF) landowners control 48% of the nation's forests, but less than 10 percent of them have written forest management plans. Stewardship management plans and multi-resource practices on these non-Federal forestlands help enhance forest and rangeland health across the entire landscape. Stewardship planning efforts are critical to this objective, but they also contribute to objectives 1.1, 2.1 and 2.4.

Forest and grassland ecosystems on NFS lands can be protected and restored through various land treatment efforts. Timber stand improvement and reforestation provide watershed improvement benefits by preventing unnecessary stream sedimentation, providing cover for wildlife, and improving the resilience of ecosystems. Timber stand improvements also benefit forest health by reducing stand density, thereby allowing the remaining stand to grow more vigorously while reducing the potential for insect and disease outbreaks and high intensity fire. Noxious weed treatment returns the vegetative community to a more natural state and restores land productivity by treating invasive weeds that threaten native plant communities. Other activities that protect and restore ecosystems include implementing

direction found in Forest Plans, project plans, and Biological Opinions. Implementation is tracked as acres where new management is applied.

Prescribed fire and other fuel reduction treatments enhance forest and range health by reducing the intensity of wildfires, protecting vulnerable urban-wildland interface areas, promoting forage production, and maintaining fire dependent ecosystems. Finally, firefighting capability is necessary to ensure fires are controlled for safety and property protection.

The consolidation of land ownerships within or adjacent to National Forest System boundaries allows the agency to better manage those lands and focus its efforts on improving the aquatic, forested and rangeland ecosystems. The land acquisition program is focused on acquisitions that will improve outdoor recreation, protect critical wildlife habitat, and preserve cultural resources. Many of the lands acquired are private inholdings within congressionally designated areas such as wilderness, Wild and Scenic River corridors and National Recreation Areas. Acquisitions under the Forest Legacy program helps conserve open space and preserve special forest and coastal areas.

**Means and Strategies:** Restoration and protection of forest and rangeland ecosystems continues to be a high priority for the agency in FY 2001. A key strategy is developing partnerships and cooperative efforts. The State and Private Forestry cooperative programs involve close coordination with Federal, State and local government organizations and private landowners. Opportunities for projects in the Forest Stewardship, Forest Legacy, Forest Health Management, and other S&PF programs are plentiful, but implementation is often limited by funding and staff shortages. As Federal dollars are often matched at a ratio greater than 1:1 by State dollars, even relatively small increases in Federal funds can result in important on-the-ground accomplishments. Building partnerships is a significant part of identifying opportunities and completing land acquisitions and exchanges. Opportunities to acquire critical parcels of land can come up quickly and sellers often demand a quick response. In these cases, close working relationships with groups such as the Trust for Public Lands and The Nature Conservancy often allow us to complete these transactions in a timely manner.

Efforts within the Forest Service and among the public continue to heighten awareness of the impacts of noxious weeds. By building support for control strategies, education will pave the way for treatment, including the use of herbicides, biological controls, and other measures. Partnerships with state and local governments are a significant part of this program.

Natural events and resource constraints serve as potential barriers to achieving this objective. Natural events, such as insect infestations and catastrophic fires, can have profound effects on forest and rangeland ecosystem health. The impacts of these events can be mitigated with appropriate control measures. A variety of practices ranging from prescribed fire to salvage harvest of infested trees can be used to mitigate the effects of these events.

Since NIPF landowners own 48 percent of the Nation's forests, their potential contributions to achieving the long-term goal of sustainable forest and rangeland ecosystems are significant. Landowner interest in participation in the Forest Stewardship Program considerably exceeds current funding and staffing available for assistance. Funding limitations can be at least partially mitigated by promoting partnership activities at the watershed level, seeking out cost-share funds, and working with the individual States to identify new sources of matching funds.

Historic funding levels have also constrained forest stand improvement projects. Nationwide, there are a significant number of stands in need of thinning. Current funding supports annual treatment of approximately two-thirds of these stands. The untreated stands accumulate over time, creating a backlog. Opportunities to increase funding for stand improvement need to be pursued. The prescribed fire program is a critical tool in the forest ecosystem health toolbox. It is used to reduce fuel accumulations, promote forage production, and restore fire-dependent ecosystems. Potential barriers to accomplishing the ambitious prescribed fire program for FY 2001 include unsuitable weather patterns, local shortages of qualified firefighters, and a lack of completed burning plans and NEPA analyses.

With regards to rangelands, even with an emphasis on the control and eradication of invasive alien species, there remains a considerable backlog of areas in need of noxious weed treatment. Because the impacts are not known definitively, pesticide use to treat noxious weeds may not be the best way to accomplish the work. Over the past few years the Forest Service is more actively pursuing the use of biological control measures. The prices of available control agents are slowly declining, but still complicate the options open to land managers.

The Forest Service participates in several crosscutting efforts. Among the interagency efforts underway, insect and disease control is instrumental to protecting forests and habitat from introduced species. The Forest Service, USDA's Animal Plant and Health Inspection Service and the Department of Commerce are working to prevent outbreaks and infestations by ensuring that logs imported from overseas are not carrying insects such as the Asian Gypsy moth that can spread quickly in the United States where they have few predators.

Since noxious weeds extend across jurisdictional boundaries, controlling and eradicating them requires extensive cooperation across State and Federal agencies. USDA, DOI, State and local rangeland managers have developed multi-State and multi-jurisdictional noxious weed management plans; worked with local highway departments to spray road rights-of-way across jurisdictions; researched biological control methods; and prepared educational materials and training courses.

**Verification and Validation:** Refer to Appendix C for a general description of Forest Service reporting systems and management and activity reviews. For fiscal year 2001, six Washington Office program reviews related to programs comprising Objective 1.2 will be undertaken in selected National Forest regions. The focus of these reviews will be on State and Private Forestry programs, Wildlife Habitat Management, Timber Sales, Forestland Vegetation, Ecosystem Restoration and Improvement, and Wildland Fire Preparedness and Operations.

**Goal 1:** Ensure Sustainable Ecosystems.

**Objective 1.3:** Increase the amount of habitat capable of supporting viable populations of all native species and support desirable levels of selected species.

**Program Activities:** National Forest System. Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 data reflect fund realignment resulting from implementation of the primary purpose principle and a revised budget structure. Comparable data for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 are not available at this time.

	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimate	FY 2001 Estimate
<b>Funding (in thousands of dollars)</b>	NA	NA	\$46,557	\$49,199
<b>FTEs</b>	NA	NA	634	626

<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/</b>	<b>FY 1998 Final</b>	<b>FY 1999 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2000 Target</b>	<b>FY 2001 Target</b>
The Forest Service will work with regulatory agencies and others to conserve species listed as threatened or endangered, or identified as sensitive				
Streams improved for fish habitat (miles):				
a) inland stream miles	911	1,164	1,275	1,405
b) anadromous stream miles	689	715	545	605
c) aquatic TES stream habitat	243	315	215	275
Forest, rangeland and lake habitat improved for wildlife and fish species (acres treated)				
a) inland lake acres	8,452	11,362	8,010	8,800
b) anadromous lake acres	1,086	4,939	5,120	5,630
c) aquatic TES lake habitat	134	45	80	110



<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/</b>	<b>FY 1998 Final</b>	<b>FY 1999 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2000 Target</b>	<b>FY 2001 Target</b>
d) terrestrial wildlife habitat restored or enhanced (acres)	167,217	184,527	174,500	272,750
e) terrestrial TE&S habitat restored (acres)	201,966	82,247	107,000	143,000
Prepare conservation agreements or strategies to guide resource management efforts for a portion of the approximately 2,100 identified sensitive species Conservation agreements and strategies and recovery plans (signed agreement)	100	269	347 2/ (78 new agreements)	419 2/ (72 new agreements)

1/ Sources include Annual Reports of the Forest Service (FYs1995-98); final MAR for FYs 1995-99; Planning and Budget Advice; and field estimates.

2/ Includes the number of sensitive species agreements and listed species recovery plans. Figures are cumulative.

**Discussion of Performance Goals:** The achievement of the annual performance goals displayed in the table above supports the accomplishment of USDA's Strategic Plan Goal 3.2: *Promote sustainable management of public lands; protect and restore critical forestland, rangeland, wilderness and aquatic ecosystems*. These indicators are described in detail in Appendix B.

Wildlife habitat protection, improvement, and restoration efforts ensure the continued availability of habitats for aquatic and terrestrial wildlife species. Stream and lake improvements are designed to restore and improve habitats for inland, anadromous, and threatened, endangered, or sensitive (TE&S) aquatic species. Terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration and enhancement efforts focus on TE&S, management indicator and focal species. Implementation of these programs results in the restoration and improvement of habitats to maintain the diversity, viability, and productivity of fish, wildlife, and botanical resources, and thus provides for their use and enjoyment by current and future generations.

Conservation agreements and strategies to stabilize and increase TE&S species populations will be emphasized in FY 2001. Improving conditions for these species, including the reintroduction of natural patterns of disturbance and other ecological processes, also benefits other wildlife and vegetation species and increases the options available from a resource management standpoint.

**Means and Strategies:** Fish and wildlife habitat restoration will be accomplished through a coordinated effort involving Forest Service employees, contracts, and partnerships with various conservation groups. Cooperative efforts with State agencies and private groups such as Trout Unlimited play a key role and will be pursued vigorously. Challenge-cost share projects with groups such as Trout Unlimited, National Wild Turkey Foundation, and The Nature Conservancy are critical to increasing the fish, wildlife, and botanical related accomplishments on our National Forests.

The Forest Service also needs to improve and consolidate information on the location and habitat relationships of TE&S species. An agency-wide emphasis on inventory and survey work and habitat relationship monitoring is essential to the agency in terms of fulfilling its legal obligations.

Potential barriers to achieving these goals include limited scientific data about some species and their habitat needs, which can delay or prolong development and implementation of conservation and restoration efforts. In other cases, sufficient data may exist, but is dispersed throughout the academic community and a variety of state and federal agencies.

Monitoring TE&S populations and their habitats within project areas is essential to ensuring that the land is being managed in such a way as to provide for their protection and for improvement of their habitats. Inadequate comprehensive landscape-level population and habitat assessments create a challenge for managing healthy ecosystems that adequately provide for imperiled species on a range-wide basis.

Crosscutting efforts are necessary to achieve these goals. Issues relating to fish, wildlife, TE&S, and botanical resources often cross landownership boundaries. Interagency cooperation in recovery efforts

will be pursued whenever possible with Federal and State agencies, tribal governments and private individuals.

In the Southeast, the Forest Service, Department of Defense, Fish and Wildlife Service and State agencies are developing a conservation strategy for protecting red-cockaded woodpecker habitat. In February 1998, a blowdown on the Angelina and Sabine National Forests in Texas damaged habitat for the woodpecker. The rapid consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and response from local groups helped the agency rehabilitate the forested habitat in the blowdown area.

**Verification and Validation:** Refer to Appendix C.

**Goal 1:** Ensure Sustainable Ecosystems.

**Objective 1.4:** Better ecosystem management decisions based on the best available scientific and management information. The following helps clarify the overall objective:

**Program Activities:** Research and National Forest System. Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 data reflect fund realignment resulting from implementation of the primary purpose principle and a revised budget structure. Comparable data for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 are not available at this time.

	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimate	FY 2001 Estimate
<b>Funding (in thousands of dollars)</b>	NA	NA	\$286,253	\$350,862
<b>FTEs</b>	NA	NA	3,150	3,566

<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/</b>	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Target	FY 2001 Target
Develop and provide to managers scientific and technical information needed to manage and sustain the forests and rangelands of the Nation Number of Research Products, Tools and Technologies Transferred to Users	NA	5,715	5,011	5,807
Provide forest-land integrated inventory on a 10-year cycle and assessments at several scales of resources on and affecting NFS lands to support formulation of policy, programs, and both forest level and project decision-making Percent of Forest Land Covered by the Annual FIA and FHM Programs	NA	NA	47.5	47.5
Above-project inventory completed (million acres)	NA	10.4	12.9	15.2
Assessments Completed (number)	123	190	148	172

1/ Sources include Annual Reports of the Forest Service (FYs 1995-98); final MAR for FYs 1995-99; Planning and Budget Advice; and field estimates. NA = Not Available.

**Discussion of Performance Goals:** The achievement of the annual performance goals displayed above supports the accomplishment of USDA's Strategic Plan Goal 3.2: *Promote sustainable management of public lands; protect and restore critical forestland, rangeland, wilderness and aquatic ecosystems.* The accomplishments also contribute to the advancement of the President's FY 1999 Clean Water and Watershed Restoration Initiative and Climate Change Technology Initiative. These indicators are defined in Appendix B.

Management of natural resources has become more complex as resource demands increase. Natural resource information developed through research is crucial in the development of Forest Service policy, programs, and helping to ensure that ecosystem health and productivity are maintained. The Forest Service Research organization provides information about the relationships between resources and natural and human-caused change. The quality of research is based on relevance of research to users.

Inventory and assessments provide the foundational information needed to ensure sustainable ecosystems. Inventory data locate, characterize, and document relationships of resource features across each national forest and grassland, and are analyzed to provide scientifically and legally defensible information for assessments and land and resource management planning.

Integrated inventories meet multiple information needs required for national forest and grassland management by collecting data on the status or conditions of resources, including vegetative and physical characteristics as well as the human dimensions of natural resources. Inventories occur at multiple scales and use different methods. The consolidated performance indicator for above-project inventories is an approximation of total acres inventoried across these scales adjusted to avoid counting the same acre more than once. The agency will track individual inventories at various scales to support this indicator.

Assessments also occur at multiple scales and provide information relevant to a broad range of resource management activities. Broad-scale assessments are used to evaluate ecosystem composition, structure, and processes and evaluate indices of ecological, social, and economic sustainability. Watershed assessments provide the contextual information necessary to focus and prioritize restoration and management. Findings associated with assessments are used to identify topics of general interest or concern to be addressed in land and resource management plans (see Objective 2.5).

**Means and Strategies:** The FY 2001 proposed budget for Forest and Rangeland Research increases from FY 2000. Projected outputs for some indicators are correspondingly higher. Other activities in support of this objective are maintained near recent levels. Partnerships involving other Federal and State agencies, as well as private sector partners, stretch dollars.

One potential barrier to ensuring that the best and most recent scientific information is used for decision-making is the breakdown in the transfer of research-developed technologies for field level implementation. Factors that contribute to the breakdown are the lack of communication between researchers and NFS managers; NFS managers not being aware of research results, and researchers that do not communicate up front to determine what information managers need. Risk-averse managers and the relatively high front-end costs of implementing new technologies also deter the application of research results. Strategic efforts to improve communication between research scientists and land managers results in improved technology transfer. Engaged dialogue helps identify the information that managers need to support improved resource management decisions and define appropriate research topics.

Inventory program effectiveness relies on data collected consistently using standard protocols. Inventory cycles are designed to keep the data as “fresh” as necessary for management decisions. Inventories are evaluated based on agency-wide principles of using a systems approach, meeting agency business requirements and customer needs, working in close collaboration with partners and customers, and providing scientifically credible information that meets rigorous quality assurance and quality control standards. Inventories are designed to facilitate integration across scales, systems, locations, and time.

Because inventory data were poorly organized and accessible throughout the agency, the Natural Resource Information System (NRIS) was designed to eliminate unnecessary, duplicative inventories; set standards for data storage and access; and develop common tools for analyzing and using the information. This will result in significant cost savings and greater efficiency in information management.

Broad-scale assessments are generally conducted for specific purposes within a defined region. Because these purposes and sizes vary considerably, flexibility is necessary for planning, developing, implementing, and reporting on the results of these assessments. Each successive broad-scale assessment benefits from lessons learned from previous efforts. The Southern Appalachian Assessment was recently completed in two years at relatively low cost, and the results have been shared by a number of Federal and State agencies and have proved invaluable in support of land and resource management planning for the region. Watershed assessments are conducted following an interagency framework for analyzing hydrologic condition of watersheds.

**Verification and Validation:** Refer to Appendix C. The National Integrated Inventories Coordinator position has recently been filled, which will mean greater oversight of inventory programs and compliance with annual reporting

**Goal 1:** Ensure Sustainable Ecosystems.

**Objective 1.5:** Naturally functioning wilderness ecosystems where conditions are determined primarily by natural forces.

**Program Activities:** National Forest System. Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 data reflect fund realignment resulting from implementation of the primary purpose principle and a revised budget structure. Comparable data for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 are not available at this time.

	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimate	FY 2001 Estimate
<b>Funding (in thousands of dollars)</b>	NA	NA	\$12,087	\$12,799
<b>FTEs</b>	NA	NA	168	171

PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS <sup>1/</sup>	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Target	FY 2001 Target
Ensure that Congressionally designated wilderness and their associated ecosystems are influenced by natural processes and protected from human-caused degradation Wilderness meeting Forest Plan standards for physical and social conditions (acres)	45,000	31,300	31,300	22,000

<sup>1/</sup> Sources include Annual Reports of the Forest Service (FYs 1995-98); final MAR for FYs 1995-99; Planning and Budget Advice; and field estimates.

**Discussion of Performance Goals:** The achievement of the annual performance goals displayed in the preceding table supports the accomplishment of USDA's Strategic Plan Goal 3.2: *Promote sustainable management of public lands; protect and restore critical forestland, rangeland, wilderness and aquatic ecosystems.* They also contribute to the advancement of the FY 1999 Land, Water, and Facility Restoration Presidential Initiative. These indicators are defined in Appendix B.

With almost 20 percent of the National Forest System designated as wilderness, the National Wilderness Preservation System plays a key role under Goal 1. Wilderness provides a benchmark for comparison with developed landscapes and offers society the associated benefits of clean water, clean air, and open spaces.

The major purpose of the congressional wilderness designation is to protect and preserve the natural, "wilderness" character of the designated area while allowing opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined outdoor recreation (see Objective 2.1). As much as possible, natural ecological processes are allowed to operate without intervention. As such, wilderness areas provide a basis for assessing the effects of changes induced by land management practices, pollution episodes, and other human induced events.

**Means and Strategies:** Partly due to the barriers discussed below, wilderness management remains outside the mainstream of Forest Service programs. The significance of wilderness in the Natural Resource Agenda and the strategic plan goals will be marketed within the agency, beginning with a clear message from Forest Service leadership on the role of wilderness in sustaining healthy ecosystems.

One major barrier is the lack of substantive direction at the forest level on how to protect, restore, and maintain the social and biophysical integrity of the wilderness resource. There are varying levels of understanding of the role that wilderness plays in sustaining healthy and diverse ecosystems. This

results in inconsistent management and variable public reactions to management decisions. Training for line officers in wilderness management helps to mitigate this lack of understanding, which in turn leads to improved management direction. In addition, there is a lack of inventory data relating to existing biological, physical, and social conditions in individual wildernesses, and throughout the National Wilderness Preservation System. Without clear and consistent information, informed budget decisions are difficult to make.

The Forest Service is involved in several interagency crosscutting efforts, including a collaborative commitment to and funding of wilderness training/education and wilderness research programs between the Forest Service, BLM, National Park Service, and Fish and Wildlife Service. At the Arthur Carhart National Wilderness Training Center and the Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research Institute, the Forest Service and DOI jointly manage facilities, conduct research and train employees. The Forest Service is also working with a number of agencies (including the Department of Defense, Federal Aviation Administration and DOI) to address threats to wilderness values and resources.

**Verification and Validation:** Refer to Appendix C.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.1:** Quality recreation experiences with minimal impacts to ecosystem stability and condition.

**Program Activities:** State and Private Forestry, National Forest System, and Reconstruction and Construction. Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 data reflect fund realignment resulting from implementation of the primary purpose principle and a revised budget structure. Comparable data for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 are not available at this time.

	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimate	FY 2001 Estimate
<b>Funding (in thousands of dollars)</b>	NA	NA	\$516,664	\$527,221
<b>FTEs</b>	NA	NA	6,079	6,072

<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/</b>	<b>FY 1998 Actual</b>	<b>FY 1999 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2000 Target</b>	<b>FY 2001 Target</b>
Offer outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive or unconfined outdoor recreation Annual education contacts (total number)	500,000	551,000	551,000	500,000
Provide additional recreation opportunities, including special uses such as outfitter, guide, and concessionaire operations Recreation special uses administered (permits)	23,000	23,792	23,700	23,000
Identify sites for future scientific evaluation, protection, and interpretation efforts, and maintain visitor satisfaction through awareness and participation in heritage site inventory, site evaluation, restoration, and protection from vandalism Heritage sites preserved/protected Heritage sites interpreted	6,795 538	4,345 593	3,200 550	2,000 400

1/ Sources include Annual Reports of the Forest Service (FYs 1995-98); final MAR for FYs 1995-99; Planning and Budget Advice; and field estimates.

**Discussion of Performance Goals:** The achievement of these annual performance goals supports accomplishment of USDA's Strategic Plan Goal 3.2: *Promote sustainable management of public lands; protect and restore critical forestland, rangeland, wilderness and aquatic ecosystems.* They also continue activities started in the FY 1999 Land, Water, and Facility Restoration Presidential Initiative. The annual performance indicators are defined in Appendix B.

Providing quality recreation opportunities depends upon a number of factors that must all come together at the National Forest and Ranger District level. One of these factors that contribute to the quality of the recreation experience is face-to-face contact with the public where information on recreation opportunities, proper land ethics and other matters is communicated.

In addition to recreation opportunities managed by Forest Service employees, additional opportunities are provided by the private sector and are authorized and administered via recreation special use permits. Examples of recreation opportunities provided by the private sector through special use permits might include organized horseback rides, mountain bike races, boat rentals on lakes, guided backpacking trips, and overnight camping at Forest Service owned campgrounds. Because they result in increased recreation opportunities, the number of recreation special use permits is tracked on an annual basis.

Heritage resources provide numerous benefits to the American people including key connections to the Nation's historic and prehistoric past. Heritage resources cover a broad spectrum including the physical remains of prehistoric and historic cultures, locations of cultural or religious significance, written records, and oral histories. Public interest in heritage tourism is increasing and this interest is being addressed through public educational experiences and opportunities.

**Means and Strategies:** Because of its technical nature, training in special uses management offers an opportunity for improving permit processing and administration, which, as discussed above, results in expanded recreation opportunities. With turnover in the Forest Service occurring on a regular basis, training is necessary to maintain special uses expertise at the Forest and Ranger District levels.

Processing special use permits, including preparation of the required environmental analysis, is a time consuming and expensive task. Because funding to process special use applications is limited, sharing the cost of processing permits with the permittee is another way that the recreation special use program can be improved.

Funding shortages often restrict visitor education and public interpretive efforts to the degree that some forests cannot offer any education or interpretive programs. Several options are available to help overcome funding shortfalls and build successful heritage resource programs at the national forest level. Education efforts within the agency and among the public are an effective way to build support for the Heritage Resources Program and an awareness of the inherent value of heritage resources. Collaborative efforts with other government agencies and private sector groups and individuals add to the success of the Forest Service's Heritage Resource Program. Collaboration and close coordination with individual State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO), tribal governments, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation will continue to occur at the national forest level. Also, the involvement of volunteers in evaluating and interpreting heritage sites plays a key role in the delivery of the Heritage program. Volunteer programs allow the agency to leverage limited funds and accomplish work that would otherwise go undone. University partnerships and Passport in Time (PIT) volunteer outreach projects require continuing support and funding and are crucial to meeting the workload needs and protecting heritage values.

Crosscutting efforts often provide opportunities to share funding and expertise, resulting in better products or services. On Forest Service and DOI lands, the "Leave No Trace" program provides users with guidance on respecting nature and ensuring that future users will be able to enjoy the recreation and wilderness values of the site. At individual sites, visitors are given basic guidance that is the same across agency boundaries. The program is also consistent with the Year 2000 National Performance Review goal of "one-stop shopping" that offers better service to the public.

National Register of Historic Places designation requires collaboration and coordination between individual State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO), the Forest Service and the National Park Service. Compliance of heritage stewardship activities also involves coordination among national forests, SHPOs and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Finally, a major barrier to providing quality recreation opportunities is the deterioration of recreation facilities. Many campgrounds and associated utility and road systems have aged to the point where complete overhaul or replacement is necessary. This situation is addressed in more detail under objective 2.8.

**Verification and Validation:** Refer to Appendix C.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.2:** Improved urban environments and enhanced community livability through healthy landscapes.

**Program Activities:** State and Private Forestry and National Forest System. Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 data reflect fund realignment resulting from implementation of the primary purpose principle and a revised budget structure. Comparable data for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 are not available at this time.

	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimate	FY 2001 Estimate
<b>Funding (in thousands of dollars)</b>	NA	NA	\$30,896	\$39,471
<b>FTEs</b>	NA	NA	40	39

<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/</b>	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Target	FY 2001 Target
Increase assistance to eligible communities to increase local capacities to assess, expand, and improve urban environments Participating communities (number)	9,635	11,101	10,000	12,850

1/ Sources include Annual Reports of the Forest Service (FYs 1995-98); final MAR for FYs 1995-99; Planning and Budget Advice; and field estimates.

**Discussion of Performance Goals:** The achievement of these annual performance goals supports accomplishment of USDA's Strategic Plan Goal 3.2: *Promote sustainable management of public lands; protect and restore critical forestland, rangeland, wilderness and aquatic ecosystems.* The annual performance indicators are defined in Appendix B.

State and Private Forestry's Urban and Community Forestry (U&CF) program provides leadership in improving and expanding urban forest ecosystems. The U&CF program assists local communities in recognizing the value of their forests, building capacity to manage community forest resources, and supporting community vitality through public involvement, commitment and action. Programs such as tree planting can help mitigate the effects of air, water, soil, and noise pollution, reduce energy use and beautify communities. These efforts can also improve the economic climate by increasing real estate values and making communities attractive to prospective businesses.

**Means and Strategies:** The Forest Service will work with State forestry and private sector agencies and volunteers to provide urban forestry assistance to local governments and nonprofit organizations. Increased volunteer involvement is a key strategy for accomplishing outputs and outcomes associated with urban forest management. Funding will be used to recruit and train volunteers. These efforts ultimately provide returns to the program that greatly exceed costs.

Through the agency's cooperative work with USDA, over 10,000 urban and community agencies, and 7,000 volunteer organizations participate in improving environmental conditions of urban forests. The Urban Resources Partnership is an excellent example. Federal agencies such as the Forest Service, Natural Resources Conservation Service and Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service all provide funding and onsite technical assistance to urban forest education and restoration efforts in urban areas across the country.

Barriers to program accomplishments include recent funding levels which have been insufficient to meet the demands. Requests from communities for Federal assistance and grants greatly exceed program capacity. To meet the challenges of limited funding, federal dollars are often combined with State funds to finance urban forestry coordinators for each State.

A lack of diversity in the urban forestry workforce presents a barrier to reaching underserved communities and ultimately reduces the overall effectiveness of the program. Successful urban forestry programs reach out to all segments of the population.

**Verification and Validation:** Refer to Appendix C.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.3:** Economically healthy and diversified rural communities operating under strategic plans for sustainable development.

**Program Activities:** State and Private Forestry and National Forest System. Payments to States are also included in this objective. Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 data reflect fund realignment resulting from implementation of the primary purpose principle and a revised budget structure. Comparable data for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 are not available at this time.

	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimate	FY 2001 Estimate
<b>Funding (in thousands of dollars)</b>	NA	NA	\$290,182	\$257,340
<b>FTEs</b>	NA	NA	88	46

<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/</b>	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Target	FY 2001 Target
Increase assistance to rural communities				
Communities and volunteer fire departments assisted (number)	NA	2,450	3,250	2,502
Communities working under broad-based local strategic plans (number) 2/	690	740	775	800

1/ Sources include Annual Reports of the Forest Service (FYs 1995-98); final MAR for FYs 1995-99; Planning and Budget Advice; and field estimates. NA = Not Available.

2/ Communities working under broad-based local strategic plans funded under Pacific Northwest Assistance Programs are tracked separately. See the FY 2001 Budget Justification for more information.

**Discussion of Performance Goals:** The achievement of these annual performance goals supports accomplishment of USDA's Strategic Plan Goal 1.3: *Provide access to capital and credit to enhance the ability of rural communities to develop, grow, and invest in projects to expand economic opportunities and improve the quality of life for farm and rural residents*, and Goal 3.2: *Promote sustainable management of public lands; protect and restore critical forestland, rangeland, wilderness and aquatic ecosystems*. These indicators are defined in Appendix B.

Through the Economic Action Programs, the Forest Service provides technical and financial assistance to help economically disadvantaged rural communities strengthen, diversify, and expand their local economies, improve transportation networks and increase access to technology. By helping to increase investments in sustainable forest management and compatible development, natural resource-dependent rural communities and natural resource-based businesses are stimulated to pursue self-sufficiency and sustainability.

Assistance to rural volunteer fire departments is a crucial activity that increases their ability to protect the natural resources that small communities rely on for their economic livelihood.



**Means and Strategies:** Strategically, it is important for rural land and business owners to move beyond the desire to capture short-term economic benefits. Demonstrating to business owners the permanent impacts of sustainable, multiresource management are important to this strategy. If individuals in rural areas understand the long-term benefits of sustainability, they can begin to take advantage of opportunities including nontraditional economic activities such as harvesting mushrooms and other nontimber products.

In terms of crosscutting efforts, the Forest Service has shared technologies, programs and funding with the USDA's Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) for many years. One activity currently under development in association with NRCS and the National Endowment for the Arts will provide rural communities with Forest Service landscape architects to support Resource Conservation Development areas. Landscape architects will work with rural communities on projects ranging from locating bicycle trails to designing recreation sites and improving aesthetic values.

**Verification and Validation:** Refer to Appendix C.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.4:** Improve the capability of the Nation's forests and rangelands to sustain desired uses, values, products, and services.

**Program Activities:** State and Private Forestry, National Forest System, and Cooperative Work - Trust Funds. Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 data reflect fund realignment resulting from implementation of the primary purpose principle and a revised budget structure. Comparable data for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 are not available at this time.

	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimate	FY 2001 Estimate
<b>Funding (in thousands of dollars)</b>	NA	NA	\$254,622	\$263,021
<b>FTEs</b>	NA	NA	3,297	3,246

<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/</b>	<b>FY 1998 Actual</b>	<b>FY 1999 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2000 Target</b>	<b>FY 2001 Target</b>
Provide a sustainable supply of forest products and range forage from NFS lands and encourage and support other landowners to do the same				
Timber volume offered (million cubic feet)	646	437	699	608
Livestock Forage (thousand animal unit months)	8,902.6	8,902.6	8,902.6	8,902.6
Complete NEPA analysis on proposed mineral operations in a timely manner, monitor operations, and ensure that mineral activities are done in an ecologically acceptable manner				
Minerals non-energy/energy operations processed (operations)	14,000	12,247	12,250	12,250
Minerals non-energy/energy operations administered to standard (operations)	7,650	9,189	6,450	9,200

1/ Sources include Annual Reports of the Forest Service (FYs 1995-98); final MAR for FYs 1995-99; Planning and Budget Advice; and field estimates.

**Discussion of Performance Goals:** The achievement of these performance goals supports USDA's Strategic Plan Goal 3.1: *Promote sustainable production of food and fiber products while maintaining a quality environment and strong natural resource base*, and Goal 3.2: *Promote sustainable management of public lands; protect and restore critical forestland, rangeland, wilderness and aquatic ecosystems*. They also contribute to the advancement of the FY 1999 Clean Water and Restoration Presidential Initiative. The annual performance indicators are defined in Appendix B.

Within the context of maintaining and restoring healthy forests and rangelands, the agency will provide a sustainable supply of values, products, and services from NFS lands and encourage and support other landowners to do the same. The forest, range, and minerals management programs provide wood, livestock forage, energy and minerals for American consumers, jobs and income to local communities, and revenues for the U.S. Treasury and the States.

The national forests are an important source of timber from Federal lands. Timber supplied from national forests has been instrumental in supplementing timber from private lands and in reducing potential fluctuations in the Nation's timber supply. Today the majority of national forest timber sales are designed to incorporate multiple objectives, including insect and disease prevention and control, wildlife habitat improvement, and fuels reduction.

When mineral operations are proposed on national forest land, the agency prepares site-specific NEPA documents for the proposed operations, determines if design or mitigation measures are necessary, and monitors and inspects the operations. By processing development proposals quickly, the agency ensures that mineral resources are available to meet demand.

**Means and Strategies:** The preparation of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis is a difficult and exacting process that is often limited by both funding and staff shortages. Identifying ways to accomplish NEPA analyses in a timely manner allows for the timely implementation of projects designed to produce timber, range forage, mineral resources and other products and services. In cases where staffing and funding are limiting factors in completing the necessary NEPA analysis, interested parties can sometimes expedite processing of their applications by helping to fund the required environmental analyses, either through contracting the work or through direct payment to the Forest Service. Implementing research findings, completing NEPA analyses in a timely manner, and closely monitoring operations ensures that management activities are done in an ecologically acceptable manner.

Crosscutting efforts often help in the implementation of projects and the subsequent production of goods, services and products. In California, for example, the Forest Service is participating with Department of Interior agencies and local community, industry, and environmental groups in the Quincy Library Group. Through this group they are working together to reach consensus on a strategy that would provide for multiple goods and services on NFS lands, including commercial thinning and fuel reduction. Previous efforts have been mired in litigation.

In Arizona and New Mexico, the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, local agency officials, tribal leaders and citizens are working together to develop a natural resource conservation and community development strategy that includes an analysis of grazing issues. Through these efforts, the Federal agencies are working to maintain grazing in upland areas while increasing protection for threatened endangered and sensitive (TES) species habitat in streamside zones. These efforts to collaborate on providing forage while protecting habitat will improve overall sustainability of southwestern rangelands.

Most mining activities require extensive coordination and review with the Department of Interior. On a national level, several Memoranda of Understanding call for close cooperation, coordination, and sharing resources with the BLM. While not specific to the minerals and geology program, they assist collaboration in process, administration, and oversight.

The extent and complexity of the NEPA process and biological evaluations (BEs) tax ranger district resources and workforces to the point that less and less needed vegetation, grazing, energy and minerals management work can be accomplished. In many situations, interest groups and individuals oppose commercial activities on NFS lands. Public opposition to these activities often culminates in administrative appeals and litigation over decisions made as a result of NEPA analyses. Appeals and litigation can delay individual projects, sometimes for years, and proposed projects are sometimes dropped to avoid expensive legal battles.

**Verification and Validation:** Refer to Appendix C.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.5:** Better resource management decisions based on the best available scientific and management information.

**Program Activities:** Research, State & Private Forestry, National Forest System, Reconstruction and Construction. Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 data reflect fund realignment resulting from implementation of the primary purpose principle and a revised budget structure. Comparable data for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 are not available at this time.

	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimate	FY 2001 Estimate
<b>Funding (in thousands of dollars)</b>	NA	NA	\$136,953	\$177,364
<b>FTEs</b>	NA	NA	1,377	1,588

<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/</b>	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Target	FY 2001 Target
Interpret monitoring results and collect and analyze information to develop new land and resource management plans or revisions Forests and grasslands initiating or completing new LRMPs or Revisions (number)	5	11	6	35
Acquire, analyze, and interpret information needed to evaluate implementation of land and resource management plans Scheduled monitoring reports (number)	56	101	133	135

1/ Sources include Annual Reports of the Forest Service (FYs 1995-98); final MAR for FYs 1995-99; Planning and Budget Advice; and field estimates.

**Discussion of Performance Goals:** The achievement of these performance goals supports USDA's Strategic Plan Goal 3.2: *Promote sustainable management of public lands; protect and restore critical forestland, rangeland, wilderness and aquatic ecosystems.* They also contribute to the advancement of the following FY 1999 Presidential Initiatives: Clean Water and Watershed Restoration Initiative, and Climate Change Technology Initiative. The annual performance indicators are defined in Appendix B.

Two annual performance indicators that are integral to accomplishment of this goal are reported under objective 1.4. These are the Number of Research Products, Tools and Technologies Transferred to Users and the Percent of Forest Land Covered by the Annual FIA and FHM Programs.

Land and resource management plans guide management decisions for all national forests and grasslands. Plans develop long-term strategies while recognizing the need to make short-term decisions and provide a framework for making future site-specific project decisions. Plans are dependent on data and information collected by inventories and assessments (see Objective 1.4).

The definition of the performance indicator for "forest plan revisions completed or underway" has been under development since FY 1997. The variance in performance levels displayed over time reflects the agency's ongoing effort to account for the multi-year revision process as well as the FY 1998 Congressional limitation placed on funds that could be utilized for plan revision activities. The performance indicator has two parts: (1) revisions initiated in the budget year, and (2) revisions completed in the budget year. Revisions started in a previous year and continuing throughout the budget year without being completed are not included in the performance data but represent a considerable portion of the annual workload and budget expenditures.

Monitoring and evaluation reporting occurs at two levels: (1) individual land and resource management plan, and (2) national forest system region. Plan reports describe the monitoring activities and associated evaluation results on how well the plans are being implemented, how effective management actions are in achieving desired results, and the validity of underlying assumptions made in the plans. Results are

used in adaptive management to keep plans current and adjust decisions to correct or improve management of the national forests and grasslands. Regional reports aggregate Plan reports and evaluate how respective regions are managing their composite national forests and grasslands. The performance indicator is the sum of the number of these two types of reports issued annually.

**Means and Strategies:** Transfer of research-developed technologies for field level implementation is a barrier to accomplishing objective 2.5. Several factors contribute. First is a lack of communication between researchers and NFS managers. In some cases, NFS managers are not aware of research results and in others, researchers do not communicate up front to determine what information managers need. Risk-averse managers and the relatively high front-end costs of implementing new technologies also deter the application of research results. Strategic efforts to improve communication between research scientists and land managers result in improved technology transfer. Engaged dialogue identifies the information that managers need to support improved resource management decisions and defines appropriate research topics.

The National Forest Management Act guides Land management planning activities and implementing regulations that require each unit of the national forest system have a land and resource management plan. These plans may be continuously amended but should formally be revised every 10-15 years. So the schedule for initiating plan revisions is based largely on the age of the plan. It takes approximately four years to revise a plan (from the initial notice of intent to the final record of decision). The complex and data-intensive nature of the existing forest planning process demands substantial time and funding.

A proposed planning rule is nearing the final stages of approval. These regulations were designed to take advantage of lessons learned over the past 20 years of forest planning. It sets forth a process that makes sustainability the foundation for planning and decision making, engages people in defining what they want the future of their forests to be like, creates plans that have a sound scientific basis, and results in plans that are living documents, which are easy to amend or revise. Implementation of this rule, once finalized, will improve the revision process and the quality of resulting plans.

Monitoring and evaluation are tools that assist in maintaining the currency of land and resource management plans. The monitoring program effectiveness relies on data collected consistently over time using standard protocols and long-term sampling procedures designed to assess specific changes in resource condition. Monitoring activities are evaluated based on agency-wide principles of using a systems approach, meeting agency business requirements and customer needs, working in close collaboration with partners and customers, and providing scientifically credible information that meets rigorous quality assurance and quality control standards. The Natural Resource Information System (described under Objective 1.4) will provide an efficient means of managing monitoring data and evaluating them in standard and appropriate ways. The new planning rule described above places special emphasis on monitoring and evaluation, and reporting should improve when the rule is implemented.

The content and format of the plan and regional monitoring and evaluation reports are undergoing continual refinement. Regular conference calls and annual workshops focus attention on improving the quality, utility, and consistency of these reports across the national forest system.

**Verification and Validation:** Refer to Appendix C.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.6:** A safe environment for the public and employees on NFS lands.

**Baseline:** These measures are new in FY 2000 and FY 2001. Baseline data for law enforcement capacity are not available at this time but will be developed soon.

**Program Activities:** National Forest System. Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 data reflect fund realignment resulting from implementation of the primary purpose principle and a revised budget structure. Comparable data for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 are not available at this time.

	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimate	FY 2001 Estimate
<b>Funding (in thousands of dollars)</b>	NA	NA	\$70,289	\$74,518
<b>FTEs</b>	NA	NA	989	1,026

<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/</b>	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Target	FY 2001 Target
Provide a safe environment for the public and employees on NFS lands				
Enforcement Capacity (number of patrol days)	NA	TBD	TBD	102,520
Investigations Conducted (number)	3,579	2,783	2,780	2,780

1/ NA = Not available, TBD = To be determined

**Discussion of Performance Goals:** The achievement of these performance goals supports USDA's Strategic Plan Goal 3.2: *Promote sustainable management of public lands; protect and restore critical forestland, rangeland, wilderness and aquatic ecosystems.* Activities initiated in 1998 by the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency are also included. The annual performance indicators are defined in Appendix B.

During FY 2001 the Forest Service will continue to work toward reducing criminal activities associated with loss and damage to natural resources and structures. Specific examples of related investigations include timber theft, arson, archeological resources, and illegal drug cultivation. Increased field presence of both Forest Service and cooperating agency personnel will contribute to a safer environment for visitors and employees.

**Means and Strategies:** Maintaining current levels of field-going law enforcement officers (LEOs) is necessary to protect natural resources, Federal property, and visitors and employees. In some NFS locations, retirement of experienced personnel is affecting law enforcement quality. There are currently a number of law enforcement officer vacancies nationwide leaving some national forests without adequate law enforcement coverage, and leaving the forest and its employees and users vulnerable to a variety of potential problems. Long-term objectives are to recruit and fill key vacancies with employees who are familiar with and representative of the areas.

Law enforcement issues cut across jurisdictional boundaries. Interagency crosscutting efforts have enabled Federal, State and county law enforcement operations to share resources and expertise. Forest Service LEOs have worked closely with Border Patrol agents to patrol the border between the United States and Mexico. Cooperative agreements provide funds to county law enforcement agencies to purchase equipment and perform patrols on NFS land. Detection and eradication of marijuana is conducted in cooperation with the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

**Verification and Validation:** Refer to Appendix C. WO program reviews related to Objective 2.9 are conducted for regions and the Washington Office as time and resources allow.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.7:** NFS resources and land title are protected through conflict-free and legally defensible boundary lines and administration of special use authorizations.

**Program Activities:** National Forest System and Permanent Appropriations. Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 data reflect fund realignment resulting from implementation of the primary purpose principle and a revised budget structure. Comparable data for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 are not available at this time.

	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimate	FY 2001 Estimate
<b>Funding (in thousands of dollars)</b>	NA	NA	\$58,419	\$60,440
<b>FTEs</b>	NA	NA	788	795

<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/</b>	<b>FY 1998 Actual</b>	<b>FY 1999 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2000 Target</b>	<b>FY 2001 Target</b>
Survey, mark, and maintain agency boundary lines to standard				
Boundary line located and maintained (miles)	NA	3,102	3,195	3,455
Cases resolved to provide and protect public access (number)	277	332	350	350
Administer special use authorizations to meet public health and safety standards				
Special Use permits administered to standard (number)	NA	18,726	6,502	6,385

1/ Sources include Annual Reports of the Forest Service (FYs 1995-98); final MAR for FYs 1995-99; Planning and Budget Advice; and field estimates. NA = not available.

**Discussion of Performance Goals:** The achievement of these performance goals supports USDA's Strategic Plan Goal 3.2: *Promote sustainable management of public lands; protect and restore critical forestland, rangeland, wilderness and aquatic ecosystems.* The annual performance indicators are defined in Appendix B.

Boundary lines established by legal surveys, which are clearly marked and posted on the ground, provide the land manager with defined perimeters for resource activities and development, while protecting the property rights of adjoining landowners and the public estate. Trespassing and encroachment on national forest land is a national problem that often requires costly legal action to resolve.

Providing necessary and appropriate administrative and public access to national forest land is an ongoing issue. While there are locations where access is adequate, there are also many locations where limited or no access prohibits the effective management of the land and/or prohibits the public from enjoying the opportunities that they provide.

Special use authorizations, including communication sites, public and private roads, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) license renewals, and energy related transmission rights-of-way, are all a part of the goods and services that are attributable to NFS lands. These permits provide support to other Federal, State, and local agencies in fulfilling their missions, provide statutory rights of access and use, and contribute to local economies.

**Means and Strategies:** Surveying expertise within the Forest Service has dwindled. As a result, landline surveys and boundary line maintenance has suffered and the result has been encroachments, costly landownership disputes, and occasional timber trespasses. Through an interagency agreement, the Forest Service and BLM participate in the FS-BLM 9800 Fund Transfer Program to share and/or transfer the costs of surveying, marking and posting boundary lines. This program ensures that boundaries are marked consistently across public lands, are only marked once, and that people needed to complete the job at either agency are available. In recent years, reimbursements have approached \$3 million annually. There is an increasing backlog of survey line maintenance where quick growing shrubs

and trees engulf boundary markers. Without clear boundaries, increases in encroachment and trespass occur. Continuing cooperation with BLM and contracts with private sector firms to accomplish landline work is necessary to accomplish FY 2001 outputs and move the agency in the direction of meeting its long-term landline goals.

Processing special use permits requires considerable technical expertise; yet, only limited funding for special use processing and training is generally available. These limitations present barriers to efficient permit processing and administration. Along with special uses, the workload associated with relicensing hydropower projects on NFS lands requires a substantial commitment of time and dollars. Funding for relicensing activities comes from other appropriations.

Strategic efforts to acquire needed rights-of-way (ROW) will ensure continuing access to NFS lands. These efforts need to include the retention of in-house skills to complete ROW acquisitions as well as management commitment to long-term access needs.

**Verification and Validation:** Refer to Appendix C for a brief description of the major reporting systems and of the management and activity review processes that are used by the Forest Service.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.8:** An efficient and effective infrastructure that supports public and administrative uses of NFS lands.

**Program Activities:** National Forest System, Reconstruction and Construction, and Permanent Appropriations. Fiscal years 2000 and 2001 data reflect fund realignment resulting from implementation of the primary purpose principle and a revised budget structure. Comparable data for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 are not available at this time.

	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimate	FY 2001 Estimate
<b>Funding (in thousands of dollars)</b>	NA	NA	\$155,802	\$142,503
<b>FTEs</b>	NA	NA	1,150	1,101

<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/</b>	<b>FY 1998 Actual</b>	<b>FY 1999 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2000 Target</b>	<b>FY 2001 Target</b>
Maintain and restore existing infrastructure to protect capital investments where they provide safe, efficient and environmentally suitable support for agency activities and public use				
Road Condition Index Rating	NA	NA	330	330
Roads without critical deferred maintenance needs (percent)	40	40	40	40
Roads open to all intended traffic (percent)	90	90	90	90
Accident frequency on roads managed and maintained for passenger cars	40	40	40	40
Bridges inspected as scheduled (percent)	NA	NA	100	100
Average Bridge Sufficiency Rating 2/	NA	NA	NA	NA
Facilities maintained to meet standard (percent)	NA	NA	NA	20
Capital improvement projects accomplished (number)	NA	62	73	79
Seasonal Recreation Capacity Available (million PAOT-days)	201	203	210	215
Reduce the backlog of trail construction needs				
Trails Maintained and Improved (miles)	NA	33,049	34,049	34,050

1/ Sources include Annual Reports of the Forest Service (FYs 1995-98); final MAR for FYs 1995-99; Planning and Budget Advice; and field estimates. TBD = to be determined. NA = not available.

2/ Data to be provided through the INFRA database. No accomplishment reports are available from INFRA at this time.

**Discussion of Performance Goals:** The achievement of these performance goals supports USDA's Strategic Plan Goal 3.2: *Promote sustainable management of public lands; protect and restore critical forestland, rangeland, wilderness and aquatic ecosystems.* They also contribute to the advancement of the following FY 1999 Presidential Initiatives: Clean Water and Watershed Restoration Initiative, and Land, Water, and Facility Restoration Initiative.

Facility and road maintenance to ensure that legal and safety requirements are met as much as possible within funding constraints helps provide for the safety of forest visitors and a healthy and safe work environment for employees. This results in higher employee productivity, improved public image, lower Worker's Compensation costs, and improved customer service through better access. Adequate facilities also increase productivity in environmental resource development and use. At the same time, roads and facilities that are maintained to an acceptable standard help conserve resources and protect ecosystems by minimizing adverse environmental impacts.

Public use at developed recreation sites is increasing--the condition and associated capacity of these and other recreation facilities, measured under objective 2.8, is declining. A greater emphasis on reconstruction of existing sites along with higher levels of road maintenance, rather than new construction, will allow the agency to improve the quality of the recreation experience. However, seasonal capacity will continue to decline until the facility maintenance backlog is corrected. Reconstructing and repairing existing trail tread, bridges, cribbing, water bars and other components better serves the backcountry user and allows for increased user capacity.

**Means and Strategies:** There is a substantial backlog of facilities in need of extensive maintenance, repair, and in some cases, reconstruction. Fifteen to 25-year old facilities are beginning to deteriorate rapidly. The "patchwork" approach to infrastructure maintenance and repair that has been funded under recent annual appropriations is no longer sufficient to keep our infrastructure safe and accessible. Recent efforts to bring the infrastructure situation to the attention of Congress and the public have heightened awareness of the problem--these efforts need to continue. Efforts to attract private funding need to be explored. Concessionaire operations, public/private ventures, and matching grants through programs such as ISTEA can also supplement appropriated funds.

Sharing facilities with other Federal agencies helps address crosscutting issues associated with facility maintenance and repair. In Colorado, the Forest Service and BLM share visitor centers and administrative offices, saves money and supports one-stop shopping for customers. USDA agencies share office space and save funds on rent and facilities in other locations as well.

**Verification and Validation:** Refer to Appendix C for a brief description of the major reporting systems and of the management and activity review processes that are used by the Forest Service.

### **Goal 3: Ensure Organizational Effectiveness.**

Goal 3, Ensuring Organizational Effectiveness differs from Goals 1 and 2 by articulating management initiatives rather than objectives. The primary difference between the two is that management initiatives are not generally related to differing program budget levels. In other words, increases or decreases in specific program funding levels may have little effect on the performance indicators for the management initiatives under Goal 3 Ensuring Organizational Effectiveness. Additionally, several performance indicators used with the management initiatives are qualitative, rather than quantitative.

**Management Initiative 3.1:** An innovative, people-oriented work environment and workforce that is representative of society as a whole and that services all customers equally.



**Program Activities:** All Forest Service Programs. In addition, Job Corps and the Senior Community Service Employment programs are financed with Department of Labor appropriations through an agreement with the Forest Service. Both programs operate on an annual fiscal year that runs from July 1 to June 30.

<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS <sup>1/</sup></b>	<b>FY 1998 Actual</b>	<b>FY 1999 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2000 Target</b>	<b>FY 2001 Target</b>
Promote an innovative, people-oriented work environment and workforce that is representative of society as a whole and that serves all customers equally				
Minorities, women, and persons with disabilities in the workforce (% of total)	48.9%	48.7%	48.9%	TBD
Minorities, women, and persons with disabilities in leadership positions (% of positions GS-13 & above)	33.2%	34.5%	35.6%	TBD
Opportunities for increased participation (no. served)				
Youth Conservation Corps	594	717	650	700
Job Corps	9,373	8,623	8,800	8,850
Senior Community Service Employment Program	5,484	5,221	5,500	5,500
Implementation of USDA civil rights initiative (% of related indicators)	NA	78.4%	80%	85%
Employee participation in CIP survey (% of workforce)	65%	46%	NA	TBD

<sup>1/</sup> Sources include Annual Reports of the Forest Service (FYs 1995-98); NFC Focus Reports for 9-30-99; FY 2000 Budget Justification; and FY 2001 Department Estimate. TBD = To Be Determined and NA = Not Available

<sup>2/</sup> CIP resurvey scheduled for FY 2001

**Discussion of Annual Performance Indicators:** Performance indicators support the agency's Management Initiative 1 described in the USDA Strategic Plan Overview.

A key component of an effective Forest Service organization is a workforce that is representative of the agency's customers and American public. The Forest Service must be able to attract, retain, and provide career opportunities for employees of various ethnic and cultural backgrounds, as well as those with disabilities. Building skills and cultural awareness for working with low-income, minority, historically underserved communities and tribal governments is also an area that needs to be emphasized.

Programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps, Job Corps, and Senior Community Service Employment provide opportunities for work, training, and education for the unemployed, underemployed, young, elderly, and others with special needs.

Measuring the rate of implementing the USDA Civil Rights Action Team's recommendations is used for gauging progress toward an innovative, people-oriented work environment.

The internal Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) provides the venue for employees to participate in surveys to identify areas within the agency where relative strengths and weaknesses exist, and to effect improvements. These improvements extend to providing better customer service.

**Means and Strategies:** The agency's Workforce Management Plan and the Affirmative Employment Program will be the basis for determining trends and progress related to women, minorities, and persons with disabilities presence in the workforce and in leadership positions at grade GS-13 and above.

Cooperation with the Department of Labor is key to continuing the Job Corps and Senior Community Service Employment programs. Youth Conservation Corps opportunities rely on agency funding from its several appropriations.

The Secretary of Agriculture established a Civil Rights Action Team in 1997, which presented 92 recommendations to improve employee and customer relations and program delivery, particularly among underserved communities. The Secretary accepted those recommendations, and many of them have been implemented within the Forest Service and/or agency-wide. For example, a team was established to resolve employee complaints dealing with civil rights issues. Improvements will be measured using indicators identified in the Civil Rights Action Team report. Work to implement the remaining recommendations is ongoing in FY 2000-2001.

The CIP survey will be undertaken again in FY 2001, while results of the FY 1999 survey are examined and actions implemented. Areas receiving the most attention include communication, human resource management, job satisfaction, organizational management, service and quality, and supervision. A national CIP action plan will be developed in FY 2000.

Factors that may affect achieving desired performance levels include recent downsizing and reduced budgets, the current political climate challenging affirmative action and civil rights, and the attitude of some employees who perceive multicultural awareness as one of many unwelcome initiatives. Additionally, the Department of Labor's "Workforce 2000" report indicates the following: (1) The number of available workers will decrease; (2) the average age of the population and the workforce will rise; (3) the pool of young workers entering the labor market will shrink; and (4) the number of less educated people in the workforce will increase. In response to these challenges, the agency is currently developing a recruitment strategy for implementation in FY 2000.

Progress in each of the performance measures is expected to be possible within current budget levels and with continued agency-wide training, along with broad scope recruitment and retention efforts. Staffing resources are primarily from the Human Resource Management and Civil Rights staffs having overall management responsibilities for the performance goals.

**Verification and Validation:** Agency program reviews scheduled for this management initiative in FY 2000 are currently being developed. Employment data is the basis for figures in the first five performance goals and is expected to be accurate. Data for the sixth performance goal is based on the number of civil rights recommendations accomplished divided by the total number of recommendations applicable to the agency. The last performance goal is based on the number of CIP surveys returned divided by the total number distributed. Both data sets are thought to be reliably accurate. See Appendix C for additional information.

**Goal 3:** Ensure Organizational Effectiveness.

**Management Initiative 3.2:** All customers receive better service.

**Baseline:** No baseline data are available for the first five qualitative performance measures in this management initiative, and only limited data exist for the last two measures.

**Program Activities:** All.

PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Target	FY 2001 Target
Provide better service for all agency customers Offer to all customers, contractors, suppliers and vendors opportunity to conduct electronic financial transactions	Some reference materials available.	Electronic payments by agency available.	Electronic submittal of key transactions initiated.	TBD
Establish internal enterprise teams to improve management efficiency of National Forests in California	Several pilot teams now in place.	Evaluations of initial efforts completed	Expansion of teams based on evaluation	TBD

PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/	FY 1998 Actual	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Target	FY 2001 Target
Offer toll-free telephone, World Wide Web, and automated applications to all permittees and applicants of most frequently requested special use permits	Joint FS and BLM web page in place.	All but toll-free telephone access is available.	New applications added as they are reengineered	TBD
Improve service to public land users by providing one-stop shopping for information, permits, and other frequently requested over-the counter products and services at BLM and Forest Service facilities	"Service first" agreement signed by FS Chief and BLM Director	"Service first" plans completed on a state-wide basis.	Continue to implement plans based on local situations & opportunities	TBD
Customer satisfaction surveys completed (number)	5	5	9	TBD
Follow up analyses (number)	NA	24	TBD	TBD

1/ Sources of data/information: Report of the Forest Service FY 1997 and 1998; FY2000 Budget Justification; FY 2001 Department Estimate; and the following agency staffs-Financial Management, R5 Reinvention Lab, Recreation, and Office of Communication. NA = Not Available and TBD = To Be Determined

**Discussion of Annual Performance Indicators:** Performance indicators support the agency's Management Initiative 2 described in the USDA Strategic Plan Overview.

The first indicator measures progress toward offering all customers, contractors, suppliers, and vendors the opportunity to conduct electronic financial transactions as a means of providing better customer service.

Establishment of enterprise teams on national forests in California has been accomplished. The intent of which is to improve management efficiencies through use of independent, self-sufficient internal business units.

The third indicator tracks additional features for special-use permittees and applicants to use when conducting business with the agency via the Internet.

Improving service for public land users by expanding one-stop shopping opportunities at both Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Forest Service facilities is intended to allow the public to conduct certain business involving either the BLM or the Forest Service at one agency office. Another interagency effort, involving the Park Service, BLM, and Forest Service, is aimed at operating and expanding the integrated, nationwide, outdoor recreation information system that gives all Americans quick and easy access for recreation use permits and reservations among the three agencies.

Customer service surveys and follow-up analyses establish and track public opinions of numerous agency programs, highlight areas for improvement, and can foster subsequent changes

**Means and Strategies:** For FY 2000 and FY 2001, the agency will expand the opportunities involving electronic financial transactions available to the public.

The FY 1999 evaluation of enterprise team performance on national forests in California was intended to determine whether the role of these teams would be expanded to other Forest Service regions. Whether this expansion will occur in FY 2000 or 2001 has not been determined.

For FY 2000 and 2001, new features are to be added to the agency's Internet site for automated applications available to all permittees and applicants for the most frequently requested special use permits.

Implementation of Forest Service and BLM statewide "Service First" plans continues for FY 2000 and 2001. Specifically, those members of the public seeking information, permits, and other frequently requested over-the-counter products and services will be afforded more opportunities for one-stop-

shopping to conduct certain business at offices of either agency. The tri-agency, recreation information system is slated for continued operation and expanded information available to the public.

There are nine customer satisfaction surveys scheduled for FY 2000. FY 2001 customer satisfaction surveys are planned with the intent of re-evaluating surveys conducted for a wide variety of Forest Service programs initially tested in FY 1997. Survey analyses and results will be used to set customer standards specific to each program. Performance will then be measured against these standards. As surveys are completed and standards set, the results may be brought forward as performance measures under the appropriate Strategic Plan/Performance Plan goals and objectives.

**Verification and Validation:** A program review schedule for this management initiative has not been developed. Information provided by the responsible staffs, including Financial Management, R5 Reinvention Lab, Recreation, and Office of Communication, describing the qualitative accomplishments of several performance measures is expected to be reliably accurate. See also Appendix C for additional information.

When surveying customer service, proper survey design and administration are critical to obtaining statistically sound results. The customer service team continues to work closely with consultants and program managers to develop sound and useful surveys.

**Goal 3:** Ensure Organizational Effectiveness.

**Management Initiative 3.3:** Integrated information systems, data structures and information management processes in place to support the agency's mission.

**Program Activities:** All.

<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/</b>	<b>FY 1998 Actual</b>	<b>FY 1999 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2000 Target</b>	<b>FY 2001 Target</b>
Enhance agency information resource systems				
IBM system users (% of employees)	70%	100%	100%	100%
Mission critical systems tested and found to be Y2K compliant (percent of total)	30%	100%	100%	100%

1/ Sources include Annual Reports of the Forest Service (FYs 1995-98); Information Resource Management staff; FY 2000 Forest Service Budget Justification; and FY 2001 Department Estimate.

**Discussion of Annual Performance Indicators:** Performance goals support the agency's Management Initiative 3 described in the USDA Strategic Plan Overview.

The percent of agency employees using the IBM system measures availability of major information processes and applications. Ensuring Y2K system compliance and subsequent operation is essential. Both of these goals were achieved in FY 1999. Consequently, these goals will be dropped in future performance plans.

**Means and Strategies:** Systems and technologies are key to accomplishing many objectives and initiatives throughout the agency's entire performance plan. The ongoing service-wide implementation of the new IBM system will also lead to more effective and efficient administrative operations. Concurrent development of improved financial systems and processes will facilitate sound resource decisions under all objectives.

Factors affecting full implementation are primarily the high cost of system hardware and software acquisition, installation and training. The agency has acquired new hardware and software, and provided necessary training, in stages to spread expenses over multiple fiscal years.

**Verification and Validation:** A program review schedule for this management initiative has not been developed. Information provided by the responsible staff, Information Resource Management, describing the accomplishments is expected to be reliably accurate. See also Appendix C for additional information.

**Goal 3:** Ensure Organizational Effectiveness.

**Management Initiative 3.4:** A sound financial system that supports resource decisions with timely, accurate information and financial expertise.

**Program Activities:** Funding for this initiative comes from multiple programs.

<b>PERFORMANCE GOALS AND INDICATORS 1/</b>	<b>FY 1998 Actual</b>	<b>FY 1999 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2000 Target</b>	<b>FY 2001 Target</b>
Develop a sound financial system supporting resource decisions				
FFIS implemented	3 Pilot Units	3 Pilot Units	Agency-wide	Agency-wide
Real Property Inventory completed (Yes/No)	No	Yes, partially.	Yes	Yes
Timber Sale Accounting system implemented (Yes/No)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Financial management reports developed showing obligations, direct/indirect costs and performance indicator costs	No	Prototype set partially completed	completed agency-wide	completed agency-wide
Unqualified audit opinion (Yes/No)	No	No, audit not completed.	Yes	Yes
Audit items from the Secretary's Management Report eliminated (Yes/No)	No	Yes, partially.	Yes	TBD
Delinquent debts referred to Treasury for offset and cross-servicing (percent)	NA	NA	50%	TBD

1/ Sources include: FY 1998 Report of the Forest Service; Financial Management staff; FY 2000 Forest Service Budget Justification; and FY 2001 Department Estimate. NA = Not Applicable and TBD = To Be Determined

**Discussion of Annual Performance Indicators:** Performance indicators support the agency's Management Initiative 4 described in the USDA Strategic Plan Overview.

**Means and Strategies:** In July 1996, the USDA Inspector General issued an adverse opinion criticizing systems, operations and skills used by the Forest Service in financial management. The audit identified seven areas of deficiency: 1) property, plant and equipment, 2) accounts receivable, 3) net position - equity of the U.S. Government accounts, 4) reimbursements, 5) revenues from the sale of goods and services, 6) program and operating expenses, and 7) depreciation and amortization expense. The agency is committed to working with the USDA Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Office of the Inspector General and the General Accounting Office to remedy these deficiencies with a goal of having an unqualified opinion on the 2000 financial audit report issued by March 2001.

By the end of FY 2000, the agency will have financial systems that: support fiscal accountability; are integrated across USDA; and facilitate comparisons of costs, revenues and accomplishments. The agency will receive unqualified audit opinions on its financial statements for FY 2000 and each year thereafter, and use this financial information and expertise to make sound resource decisions. The agency will respond to OIG audits in a timely manner and ensure that items are resolved prior to being listed on the Secretary's Management Report. The agency will expand its efforts to collect external debts using the tools provided in the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996.

Factors that could affect accomplishments include the difficulty of developing new systems and methodologies to track and report on the complex array of information; and coordination requirements of the agency with the National Finance Center, USDA Office of Inspector General, General Accounting Office, and contracted consultants.

**Verification and Validation:** A program review schedule for this management initiative has not been developed. Information provided by the responsible staff, Financial Management, describing the accomplishments is expected to be reliably accurate. See also Appendix C for additional information.

**Goal 3:** Ensure Organizational Effectiveness.

**Management Initiative 3.5:** An effective and efficient administrative organization that supports the Forest Service Mission.

**Program Activities:** All.

**Performance Goals and Indicators:**

During FY's 2000 and 2001 the agency will continue to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of its administrative organization supporting its mission.

Performance indicators for this management initiative have not been developed. Availability of data, consistency of definitions, and utility for managers are factors that will determine whether indicators are used in annual performance measurement or longer term monitoring.

**Discussion of Annual Performance Indicators:** There are currently no indicators developed for this management initiative. This management initiative relates to the agency's Management Initiative 5 described in the USDA Strategic Plan Overview.

**Means and Strategies:** The President's National Performance Review (NPR) encouraged agencies to review their business processes in order to identify inefficiencies. The Forest Service reinvention study identified a number of processes that could be improved through reengineering. The Congress has also taken steps to increase accountability for performance. The public is demanding more efficient and effective governmental operations. These demands for a businesslike framework for management and accountability coincide with decreasing Federal budgets. Developing a method to assess improved business functions should lead the Forest Service to operate more efficiently and effectively. Reengineering business processes requires close coordination with the Administration mission area of USDA.

The Forest Service initiated *Project Ponderosa* (June 1998) to focus attention, energy and resources on improving the manner in which the agency conducts its business operations. Several teams commissioned by the Chief Operating Officer have taken the first steps in identifying ways of improving and simplifying the budget structure, management, and work activity codes; developing useful and accurate financial reports for managers; and identifying staffing to achieve desired results.

Factors affecting potential achievement of this goal include the complexity of issues and systems, and the difficulty of overcoming past traditions and practices. In addition, development of performance indicators for this management initiative has not been done, therefore, progress cannot be easily measured.

The ongoing agency-wide implementation of the new IBM system and related applications are central to these efforts in more effective and efficient administrative operations. Concurrent development of improved financial systems and processes will facilitate cost/revenue comparisons and further enhance sound resource decisions under all objectives. The implementation of Geographic Information System (GIS) capabilities as an integral part of the new system will also foster more thorough analyses of resource information and improved decision support.

**Verification and Validation:** A program review schedule for this management initiative has not been developed.

## APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF AGENCY RESOURCES FOR FY 2000 <sup>1/</sup>			
\$ in thousands			
	Goal 1: Sustainable Ecosystems	Goal 2: Multiple Benefits	TOTAL
Forest & Rangeland Research	\$161,094 1,988 FTEs	\$56,600 698 FTEs	\$217,694 2,686 FTEs
State, Private, and International Programs	\$120,651 568 FTEs	\$82,309 240 FTEs	\$202,960 808 FTEs
National Forest System	\$542,818 6,889 FTEs	\$605,133 8,150 FTEs	\$1,147,951 15,039 FTEs
Wildland Fire Management	\$617,956 7,451 FTEs	0 0 FTEs	\$617,956 7,451 FTEs
Infrastructure Improvement Maintenance	\$74,715 772 FTEs	\$362,128 3,259 FTEs	\$436,843 4,031 FTEs
Land Acquisition <sup>1/</sup>	\$160,835 124 FTEs	0 0 FTEs	\$160,835 124 FTEs
Other Discretionary Appropriations	0 0 FTEs	\$26,694 37 FTEs	\$26,694 37 FTEs
Permanent Appropriation	\$95,512 1,191 FTEs	\$137,244 1,344 FTEs	\$232,756 2,535 FTEs
Trust Fund Appropriations	\$219,277 1,723 FTEs	\$9,163 81 FTEs	\$228,440 1,804 FTEs
Payments To States	0 0 FTEs	\$234,854 0 FTEs	\$234,854 0 FTEs
TOTAL	\$1,992,858 20,706 FTEs	\$1,514,125 13,809 FTEs	\$3,506,983 34,515 FTEs

SUMMARY OF AGENCY RESOURCES FOR FY 2001 <sup>1/</sup>			
\$ in thousands			
	Goal 1: Sustainable Ecosystems	Goal 2: Multiple Benefits	TOTAL
Forest & Rangeland Research	\$170,946 1,957 FTEs	\$60,062 687 FTEs	\$231,008 2,644 FTEs
State, Private, & International Programs	\$163,396 578 FTEs	\$97,935 196 FTEs	\$261,331 774 FTEs
National Forest System	\$621,592 7,328 FTEs	\$664,979 8,565 FTEs	\$1,286,571 15,893 FTEs
Wildland Fire Management	\$770,372 7,178 FTEs	0 0 FTEs	\$770,372 7,178 FTEs
Infrastructure Improvement Maintenance	\$74,070 745 FTEs	\$350,844 3,096 FTEs	\$424,914 3,841 FTEs
Land Acquisition	\$130,265 112 FTEs	0 0 FTEs	\$130,265 112 FTEs
Other Discretionary Appropriations	0 0 FTEs	\$5,500 36 FTEs	\$5,500 36 FTEs
Permanent Appropriation	\$92,083 1,047 FTEs	\$129,695 1,244 FTEs	\$221,778 2,291 FTEs
Trust Fund Appropriations	\$227,292 1,653 FTEs	\$10,323 89 FTEs	\$237,615 1,742 FTEs
Payments To States	0 0 FTEs	\$222,540 0 FTEs	\$222,540 0 FTEs
TOTAL	\$2,250,016 20,598 FTEs	\$1,541,878 13,913 FTEs	\$3,791,894 34,511 FTEs

<sup>1/</sup> In addition to the FTE reported here, an additional 1,099 FTE were paid out of transfer accounts in both years.

<sup>2/</sup> The Land Acquisition amount for FY 2000 includes \$79,835,000 in Title II LWCF funds and \$81,000,000 in Title VI Priority Land Acquisition and Exchange funds.

**APPENDIX B**

**FY 2001**

**PERFORMANCE MEASURE DEFINITIONS**

The performance indicators in the FY 2001 Performance Plan are presented by Objective and are highlighted in bold.

**Objective 1.1**

**Land treatments to protect and improve watershed conditions on NFS lands (acres treated):**

Includes land treatments and structural improvements to increase the quality and quantity of water, and maintain or improve soil productivity. Land treatments are designed to rehabilitate soils and plant cover to achieve reductions of erosion and sedimentation; reduction and prevention of floods; water conservation and increased productivity. Structural measures are used to control water within channels and gullies resulting from accelerated runoff and on slopes where a threat of accelerated erosion exists. Includes linear treatments for riparian areas, stream banks, and channels, which are converted to acres.

**Roads decommissioned (miles):**

The miles of road restored to natural resource management and the removal of the road from the Forest Service road system.

**Objective 1.2**

**Lands restored by the reforestation**

This includes activities of planting, seeding, and natural means, including site preparation for natural regeneration, and certification of natural regeneration without site preparation.

**Treatment of harvest-related woody fuels – brush disposal (acres):**

The treatment of fuels generated from timber sales and timber stand improvement activities (i.e., brush disposal). Techniques can include logging and scattering and hand or mechanical piling and burning.

**Land treatments to protect and restore forest and grassland ecosystems on NFS lands (acres treated):**

Land treatments designed to restore or maintain healthy conditions and reduce risk and damage from fire, insects and diseases, and invasive species (funded by discretionary appropriations). Types of land treatments include:

- Noxious Weed Treatments: includes initial and retreatment efforts aimed at managing infestations of noxious weeds and preventing further infestations
- Rangelands restored and protected
- Timber sales: Acres of timber sales sold to achieve ecosystem stewardship objectives (only those formerly funded with NFTM)

**Forestlands maintained or enhanced by stand improvement (acres treated):**

Includes techniques such as release, weeding, thinning, fertilization and pruning.

**Hazardous fuels reduction (acres):**

The acres of treated wildland fuel occurring naturally or not covered by activity fuel funding including acres directly affected by management-ignited prescribed fire, prescribed natural fire, and mechanical or chemical treatments that reduce fire hazard.

**Firefighting production capability (% of Most Efficient Level (MEL)):**

The NFMAS model develops the Most Efficient Level of funding (MEL) for the national fire management organization based on minimizing the sum of suppression costs and natural resource value losses. The



availability of the specific mix of resources is tied directly to a unit's NFMAS analysis (the Most Efficient Level); this performance indicator measures the national percent of MEL that is achieved with the given funding level.

**Land ownership consolidated through acquisition and exchange to facilitate restoration and protection (acres):**

Fragmented land ownership consolidated through fee and partial interest acquisition and exchange to facilitate conservation and stewardship objectives. Represents a combination of all land acquisition acres.

**Nonindustrial private forestlands (NIPF) under approved Stewardship Management Plans (acres):**

The Forest Stewardship Program assists nonindustrial private forest landowners on a voluntary, nonregulatory basis to develop long-term Forest Stewardship Plans for the management of their forests and related resources. The indicator measures the total acreage included in long-term Forest Stewardship Plans, which are developed to assist nonindustrial private forest landowners, on a voluntary, nonregulatory basis, manage their forests and related resources. These plans are developed with technical assistance delivered, in cooperation with the States, to interested nonindustrial private forest landowners.

**Multiresource practices implemented on NIPF lands (acres):**

Forest Stewardship Management Plans can be implemented by landowners through approved, cost-shared, multiresource management practices. The indicator measures the acres of multi-resource practices implemented that advance the actual management of all resources such as soil and water, wildlife, recreation, agroforestry, and aesthetics, in a balance that reflects the landowners' goals.

**Legacy Project Acquisition (acres):**

The Forest Legacy Program conserves environmentally important forests threatened by conversion to nonforest uses through the acquisition of land or interests in land from willing landowners. The indicator measures acres protected, through conservation easements or fee simple acquisition, based on opportunities identified in Statewide assessments developed under this program as well as particular national opportunities and priorities.

**Forest Health surveys and evaluations, Federal and Cooperative lands (million acres):**

Forest Health surveys and evaluations are a component of the State and Private Forestry Forest Health Management program. These forest insect and disease detection surveys and evaluations, conducted for all Federal forest lands including National Forest System, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, Corps of Engineers, Smithsonian Institution, and Department of Defense lands. Additionally, these surveys and evaluations assure the early detection of forest insect and disease issues for non-federal lands. Early detection facilitates delivery of professional forest health assistance through cooperation with State governments to private landowners. Assistance is also provided to tribal governments.

**Objective 1.3**

**Streams improved for fish habitat (miles):**

This measures miles of rivers and streams that were restored or enhanced for fisheries or TES species habitat using structural or nonstructural improvements accomplished with appropriated funds. Examples of stream or river improvements include the placement of large woody debris and the placement of boulders to provide spawning habitat.

**Forest, rangeland and lake habitat improved for wildlife and fish species (acres treated):**

The total number of acres restored or enhanced to achieve desired future condition of wildlife, fish and TES species habitat using appropriated funds. Restoration and enhancement is accomplished using appropriated funds through application of a variety of management practices such as prescribed burns, seeding to improve foraging habitat for game birds, or manipulating vegetation to obtain the desired habitat condition.

**Conservation agreements and strategies and recovery plans (signed agreements):**

Report the number of recovery and conservation tasks that were completed in the fiscal year for sensitive aquatic and terrestrial species. Recovery plans and conservation strategies include assignment of specific tasks to agencies. For those Federally listed species having either FWS approved recovery plans or conservation strategies or sensitive species having a conservation strategy approved by Forest Supervisors or Regional Foresters, those tasks required of the Forest Service in the given year that were accomplished are reported.

**Objective 1.4****Number of research products, tools, and technologies transferred to users:**

Information provided to public and private land managers and policy-makers that enhances scientific understanding of ecosystems, assists in effectively managing the Nation's forests and rangelands and meets existing legal and regulatory requirements. Includes books, papers in series, journal articles, proceedings, general technical reports, special reports, patents, videos, computer programs, dissertations and theses, and other similar technology transfer accomplishments.

**Percent of forestland covered by annual FIA/FHM:**

Information provided to public and private land managers and policy-makers that characterize resource status, conditions and trends. The Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) program provides the only continuous inventory that periodically quantifies the status of forest ecosystems, including timber and nontimber information, across all land ownerships in the U.S. FIA strives to maintain current State inventories on the shortest cycle possible. The Forest Health Monitoring plot system identifies and tests environmental indicators and provides data to evaluate the health of all of the Nation's forests.

**Above-project inventory completed (million acres):**

Integrated inventories are designed to meet multiple needs for information at various scales above the project level, and consist of data collection activities to provide information for analysis of the status and/or conditions of natural resources (physical, biological, and human dimensions) required for national forest and grassland management.

**Assessments completed (number):**

Assessments are characterizations of ecosystems above the project level (e.g., eco-regional, eco-subregional, river basin, landscape and watershed) which provide information to support formulation of policy, programs, and forest/grassland plans as well as provide context for project scheduling and subsequent project analysis.

**Objective 1.5****Wilderness meeting Forest Plan standards for physical and social conditions (acres):**

Providing wilderness stewardship that "protects and/or restores" wilderness characteristics to units of the National Wilderness Preservation System. Requirements include having adequate and appropriate Forest Plan standards and guidelines for wilderness, monitoring wilderness condition to assess compliance, and determining whether standards are met or exceeded.

**Objective 2.1****Annual education contacts (number):**

The number of individual wilderness and "Leave No Trace" contacts of at least 5 minutes in duration that are made annually in which specific information on wilderness is transmitted with a high likelihood of understanding by the participant.

**Recreation special uses administered (permits):**

The total number of Special Use Permits in existence at the end of the fiscal year. This includes permits administered to standard and those not administered to standard but on the books.

**Heritage sites preserved and protected (number):**

Number of heritage sites protected this fiscal year. Protection refers to any deliberate, planned activity that shields a site or its information potential from natural or human-caused damage or destruction. This includes the indirect protection of properties by fencing, removing impacting activities & facilities, preventing or controlling access, and monitoring site conditions. Preservation includes restoring, repairing, or rehabilitating heritage properties in order to make them last longer or serve the public better. Sites afforded protection through project planning; redesign and implementation (site avoidance) are not counted in this category.

**Heritage sites interpreted (number):**

The number of heritage sites newly developed for on-site or off-site public interpretation. Includes interpretive displays, guided tours, trails, interpretive brochures, interpretive signs, etc.

**Objective 2.2****Participating communities (number):**

The number of communities that have qualified for base program support and are actively engaged in program activities.

**Objective 2.3****Communities and volunteer fire departments assisted (number):**

The number of communities and local Volunteer Fire Departments assisted through grants or other cooperative agreements, that provide technical and financial assistance directly to communities, through the States, to effectively and adequately protect State lands and improve fire fighting coordination across jurisdictions and to local Volunteer Fire Departments to effectively and adequately protect private lands.

**Communities working under broad-based local strategic plans (number):**

The number of rural communities that have developed strategic plans to achieve sustainable development, in cooperation with capacity building skills delivered through the Economic Action Programs.

**Objective 2.4****Timber volume offered (million cubic feet):**

The preparation and advertisement for sale (Gate 4 completed) of timber, including all convertible products, which have not been previously advertised for sale.

**Livestock forage (thousand animal unit months):**

The amount of sheep, goat, cattle and horse grazing use billed in the current fiscal year.

**Minerals nonenergy/energy operations processed (operations)**

The processing of all minerals nonenergy and energy operations including:

- Bonded nonenergy operations: the number processed for which reclamation bonds were required.
- Nonbonded nonenergy operations: the number processed that did not require a reclamation bond, such as Plans of Operations under 36 CFR 228.A for which bond requirements were waived, Notices of Intent, or free use mineral material permits for the public.
- New energy operations, including those conducted under reserved and outstanding rights, that require environmental analysis.

**Minerals nonenergy/energy operations administered to standard (operations):**

The administration of all minerals nonenergy and energy operations including bonded nonenergy operations administered to a level which ensures compliance with operating plans and energy operations,

including those conducted under reserved & outstanding rights, administered to a level which ensures compliance with operating plans.

### **Objective 2.5**

#### **Forests and Grasslands initiating or completing new LRMPs or revisions (number):**

New plans or plan revision activities are initiated or completed through integrated interdisciplinary planning and are guided by regulations for the National Forest Management Act (NFMA). The need to change an existing land and resource management plan (LRMP) is determined by an evaluation of the effectiveness of current direction and consideration of desired future conditions of national forests and grasslands.

#### **Scheduled monitoring reports completed (number):**

Monitoring and evaluation reports document the monitoring activities and evaluate their significance at two organizational levels: National Forest/Grassland and region. Monitoring activities are categorized as (a) implementation monitoring to determine if Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) decisions were implemented as designed, (b) effectiveness monitoring to determine if prescribed measures functioned as envisioned, and (c) validation monitoring to determine if the assumptions used in planning or decision making, above the project level, are valid. Monitoring activities include those specified in LRMP monitoring plans, in addition to monitoring of ecosystem conditions consistent with the Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management.

### **Objective 2.6**

#### **Enforcement Capability (number of patrol days):**

Routine patrols of NFS lands to ensure a safe environment for the public and employees, and for protection of the natural resources. Patrols are conducted by agency law enforcement personnel and enhanced by implementation of 547 Cooperative Agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies.

#### **Investigations conducted (number):**

Internal and external investigations related to the use and management of NFS lands and property conducted in compliance with applicable guidelines set forth in the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency "Quality Standards for Investigations."

### **Objective 2.7**

#### **Boundary line located and maintained (miles):**

Boundary line located and marked as well as maintained to agency standards for all NFS property lines, including boundaries of all Special Management Areas located on NFS lands.

#### **Cases resolved to provide and protect public access (number):**

The number of rights-of-way acquisitions, trespass, encroachment and other actions resolved. Rights-of-way cases include the number of road and trail right-of-way easements acquired, resolved through other lands activities, or by cooperative effort. These activities coincide with Categories I, II and III on the existing annual Rights-of-Way Acquisition Report (FS-5400-25 4/92).

#### **Special use permits administered to standard (number):**

Special use authorizations administered to standard are in compliance with the terms and conditions of the authorization and Forest Service policy. At a minimum, the use must be under current authorization, must be in compliance with applicable health and safety laws, regulations and Forest Service policy, and must have fees that have been determined and collected.

### **Objective 2.8**

#### **Road Condition Rating Index (change):**

The amount of change in a composite index consisting of the following indicators:

- Roads without critical deferred maintenance needs (percent)
- Roads open to all intended traffic (percent)
- Accident frequency on roads managed and maintained for passenger cars
- Bridges inspected as scheduled (percent)
- Average Bridge Sufficiency Rating

The change in road condition rating index will be planned for and measured against a baseline established for FY 2000.

**Facilities maintained to standard (number):**

Forest Service facilities used for recreation, research, fire, administrative, and other purposes require annual and deferred maintenance to meet health and safety requirements. Refer to section 8 of the FY 2001 budget justification for further details.

**Capital improvements completed (number):**

Facilities capital improvements include new construction, alteration of an existing facility to change the function, and expansion to change the facility's capacity to serve needs different from what was originally intended.

**Seasonal capacity available (million PAOT days):**

The cumulative total persons-at-one-time (PAOT) days of developed facility capacity made available during the recreation season. This includes the capacity available to standard and the capacity available not to standard.

**Trails maintained and improved (miles):**

Maintenance and improvement (i.e., reconstruction/construction) work on year-round system trails on NFS lands.

## APPENDIX C:

### VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION

Due to its decentralized structure and wide scope of programs and activities, the USDA Forest Service maintains several systems to track performance and provide management information. These include the following:

- Management Attainment Reporting (MAR) system used mainly for the National Forest System programs
- Performance Measures Accountability System (PMAS) used for State and Private Forestry to track cooperative forestry programs
- Research Budget Attainment Information System (RBAIS) used by Research and Development
- Wildlife, Fish, and Rare Plants (WFRP) used to track species and habitat programs
- Infrastructure database (INFRA) used to maintain and track information on Forest Service infrastructure assets

The section below provides a general description of the data and some general concerns regarding the quality of data from these various sources used by the Forest Service to track performance.

**MAR:** MAR is used to set performance targets toward the start of the fiscal year and report on accomplishments at the end of each fiscal year. Each Forest Service region is assigned an accomplishment target for select MAR items after final appropriations and allocation decisions are made. Often, regions request mid-year adjustments to their MAR targets to reflect changes in priorities, needs, costs, or resources. These adjustments may occur after the final version of the Performance Plan is completed, which means MAR targets differ from Performance Plan targets included in this report. Forest Service field employees submit MAR data for district accomplishments through Forest Supervisors to their regional offices, where data are reviewed and aggregated for the region before being submitted to the Washington Office in electronic and paper format. Some indicators are only reported through MAR while others are included in other reports submitted by the fields or regions.

MAR data are submitted twice each year. In August, regions submit a 10-month report showing projected accomplishments. Then in November, regions submit a final report with actual accomplishments. The Washington Office usually receives final reports in mid to late November in both electronic and paper format. The electronic format consists of a spreadsheet with totals by region. These spreadsheets are fed into a database to generate national totals.

MAR submissions go through several layers of review, starting at the forest supervisor level, then through regional managers, and finally Washington Office review. During our GPRA report preparation process, the Forest Service identified several weaknesses in the MAR report process. Current checks are not sufficient to ensure that MAR data are complete, accurate, and consistent. We found cases of missing, incomplete, or inaccurate data, and discovered we do not have sufficient checks in place to ensure that our performance data from MAR are complete, accurate, and consistent with other data sources. We took steps to correct these problems when we identified them and the FY 1999 data represent what we believe to be the best currently available. However, we know that weaknesses exist in our current data collection and reporting system. Consequently, we will undertake a more thorough review during FY 2000 to identify the sources of these problems and develop strategies to correct them to ensure improvements in our performance measures in the near future.

A separate issue involves definitions, both for MAR and other items as well. MAR measures have standard definitions for each data element. These definitions are distributed throughout the agency at all organizational levels with instructions that they are to be used by all data providers and managers to promote consistency. These definitions appear in Appendix B of this report and in the FY 1999/FY 2000 Performance Plan. Questions on the definitions and measure may originate at all organizational levels, but ultimate responsibility for ensuring consistency in the interpretation of these definitions resides with

the Washington office. Despite these efforts, data quality problems can still occur. Sources contributing to data quality problems include a lack of understanding of MAR item definitions by data providers and/or reviewers, how MAR items should be measured, and when accomplishments should be recorded.

**PMAS:** State and Private Forestry tracks performance measures related to its programs using the Performance Measures Accountability System (PMAS). PMAS data represents accomplishments for Cooperative Forestry programs throughout the United States. At the start of the fiscal year, Cooperative Forestry Regional Directors are provided with performance measures that require accomplishment reporting. Those indicators are shared with State Foresters who have the responsibility of making sure the data are collected at the local level. Data undergo several layers of review, beginning at the local level, moving to the state, regional, and finally the national level. Accomplishment data are kept in local databases and then provided to the regional and national level in hardcopy form. Accomplishment reports are due in the Washington office by the second week of November.

Currently, the Washington office is in the process of developing an electronic system that will facilitate data entry from the local level, allowing immediate access to the data at any time. The system will provide quarterly and mid-year status reporting and analysis, which should improve the Forest Service's ability to monitor, evaluate, and manage these programs.

**RBAIS:** Forest Service Research and Development program maintains the Research Budget Attainment Information System (RBAIS). RBAIS tracks funding and attainment at the Research Work Unit (RWU) level. At the beginning of the year, Research and Development funding is allocated to Research Stations based on Congressional direction. Each station then allocates funding to RWUs. Each RWU submits data on attainment to the Research Station budget coordinator. The data are reviewed by Station Assistant Directors and then forwarded to the National Budget Coordinator and the Research and Development Staffs in the Washington office. The Research Staffs review the data, prioritize accomplishments, and provide input to the Budget Coordinator on the annual RBAIS Report. The Research and Development Budget Coordinator organizes the data into a final report that is incorporated into the USDA Forest Service annual report. Data quality problems occur infrequently, and when they do, they are centered on revisions made to RBAIS. The RBAIS measure for scientific papers includes books, papers in series, journal articles, dissertations and theses, and other similar peer-reviewed accomplishments that are primarily related to ecosystem sustainability.

**WFRP:** The Wildlife, Fish, and Rare Plants (WFRP) database tracks, among other things, conservation agreements and number of listed species covered by recovery plans. At the end of each fiscal year, field employees submit program data and project narratives for items tracked in the WFRP database to regional office program leaders for these programs. The data are reviewed and entered into an oracle database. The data is then retrieved from each regional database and merged into a national database at the Washington Office. A final validation process is used at the WO before the data is used to respond to Congress, administration, and partners. Standard definitions for each data element are available to all field employees via the National WFRP Website. These definitions are provided to ensure consistency across organizational levels. Data are available from this database about four months after the close of the fiscal year.

**INFRA:** INFRA is a nationally deployed application providing integrated inventory of constructed features, roads, trails, and land units while automating several related business functions in financial management, acquisition management, and permits. The application will deliver reports on inventories, real property, and detailed reports on Forest Service deferred maintenance needs. It also contains modules for billing, financial management, and other special uses. Separate modules of INFRA were released and installed on the IBM system during FY 1998 and 1999. Basic inventory data migrated from the earlier Data General system to the new IBM INFRA system as modules were developed and completed. INFRA 3.0, which contains data on several performance indicators, was released in July 1999. Since then, field units have been aggressively collecting deferred maintenance data, general inventory information, as well as other data used to manage all types of assets.

The Forest Service is now beginning the lengthy tasks associated with reviewing, validating, updating, and adding to existing information in INFRA. In some cases, field units have not fully populated some parts of INFRA. Field units have not yet entered certain data into the database, making it difficult or impossible to report some non-MAR items at this time. We expect over the next 1-2 years, data in INFRA will become more complete as field units enter specific information into the system. Management will provide additional guidance and impetus within targeted program areas in order for the Forest Service to provide better information about these various assets.

Further INFRA development and enhancements are ongoing with additional modules scheduled for implementation in FY 2000 and beyond. These new portions of the application will allow for expanded upward reporting of specific program data as well as providing ties to other systems such as the national reservation system and providing the field with business and inventory tools. Business function enhancements include interface with the Forest Service new financial information and accounting system for all real property transactions and permit billing, expanded GIS interface, and new and improved reporting capabilities via standard reports and through ad hoc Microsoft tools.

### **Crosscutting Issues**

The Forest Service is committed to collecting, reporting, and making decisions based on the best data possible. This means ensuring that data are accurate, reliable, complete, timely, and validly reflect the Forest Service's strategic goals and mission. As part of its GPRA performance planning and reporting efforts, the Forest Service has uncovered some potential problems that raise questions regarding how much confidence can be placed in data for certain performance indicators. These involve ensuring that data are collected in a timely fashion, data entry errors and missing sources are identified and corrected, and inconsistencies in data are resolved promptly and completely.

In FY 2000, the Forest Service will review the MAR data system of collecting and reporting on various performance indicators and accomplishments. Its objective will be to streamline data collection efforts and improve consistency in how data definitions are interpreted and applied. In addition, the Forest Service is moving toward a data warehouse of financial and performance data. One of the main goals of the warehouse is to maintain a central repository of data that has gone through quality assurance and quality control, thereby eliminating duplicate systems that often create data inconsistencies.

**Management and Activity Reviews:** On-site reviews of organizational units and resource programs are the primary means of monitoring the agency's progress in meeting annual outputs and in moving towards the goals and objectives identified in the strategic plan. A variety of reviews are conducted each fiscal year and the level of detail varies depending upon where it originates. For example, Washington Office (WO) reviews conducted by the deputy chiefs concentrate on overall program operation such as Research, S&PF, and the National Forest System, whereas reviews initiated by forest supervisors tend to be much more detailed and can focus on a single activity within a program on a single ranger district. TES habitat improvement within the broader program area of Wildlife, Fish and Rare Plants is an example of an activity that might be reviewed at the forest supervisor level. Activity reviews can be initiated at all levels of the organization and are the most common because they examine the detailed operations that use personnel, capital, and information.



## APPENDIX D:

OBJECTIVE CROSSWALK BETWEEN STRATEGIC PLAN  
AND PERFORMANCE PLAN

Fiscal Year (FY) 2001 will be the fourth year in which the agency has operated under the Results Act Strategic Plan, approved September 30, 1997. Efforts to revise the Strategic Plan are underway, with a final product expected within the next 12 months. FY2001 is the third year for which an annual performance plan is legally required as part of the President's Budget Justification. The FY 1998 and 1999 plans introduced key concepts, components, and an initial set of performance indicators. The FY 1999-2000 multi-year version incorporated the most current performance indicators, output targets, and prior year accomplishments available at that time. This FY 2001 plan continues to fine-tune the performance indicators and objectives that are reported under each of the three strategic goals. Refer to Appendix B for a complete set of performance indicator definitions.

Since the Strategic Plan was approved in 1999, the organizational structure for the objectives has been modified, as shown in the following table. While the strategic goals remain unchanged, adjustments to the budget structure and performance indicators have been made in recent months to achieve greater consistency from one year to the next. These changes are minor and within the scope of the existing Strategic Plan.

Strategic Plan 1997 – 2002 (Sept. 1997)	FY 2000 Annual Performance Plan, (Feb. 1999)	FY 2001 Annual Performance Plan (Feb. 2000)
Objective 1.1: Aquatic Ecosystems - <i>Healthy, diverse, and resilient aquatic ecosystems restored and protected to maintain a variety of ecological conditions and benefits and conserve biological diversity.</i>	Objective 1.1: Ensure Healthy and Diverse Aquatic Ecosystems - <i>Healthy, biologically diverse and resilient aquatic ecosystems restored and protected to maintain a variety of ecological conditions and benefits.</i>	Objective 1.1: Ensure Healthy and Diverse Aquatic Ecosystems - <i>Healthy, biologically diverse and resilient aquatic ecosystems restored and protected to maintain a variety of ecological conditions and benefits.</i>
Objective 1.2: Forested Ecosystems - <i>Ecological integrity of forested ecosystems restored or protected to maintain biological and physical components, functions and interrelationships, and the capability for self-renewal.</i>	Objective 1.2: Ensure Healthy and Diverse Forestlands - <i>Ecological integrity of forested ecosystems restored or protected to maintain biological and physical components, functions and interrelationships, and the capability for self-renewal.</i>	Objective 1.2: Ensure Healthy and Diverse Forest and Rangeland Ecosystems - <i>Ecological integrity of forest and rangeland ecosystems restored and protected to maintain biological and physical components, functions and interrelationships, and the capability for self-renewal</i>
Objective 1.3: Rangeland Ecosystems - <i>Healthy, diverse and resilient rangeland ecosystems restored and protected to maintain robust riparian systems, a variety of ecological conditions and benefits, and biodiversity.</i>	Objective 1.3: Ensure Healthy and Diverse Rangelands - <i>Healthy, diverse and resilient rangeland ecosystems restored and protected to maintain robust riparian systems, a variety of ecological conditions and benefits, and biodiversity.</i>	Combined under Objective 1.2 above.
Objective 1.4: Hazardous Substances Sites- <i>Healthy, diverse and resilient aquatic and terrestrial resources restored and protected through hazardous substances site response.</i>	Objective 1.4: Respond to Hazardous Substance Sites - <i>Healthy, diverse and resilient aquatic and terrestrial resources restored and protected through hazardous substances site response.</i>	Combined under Objective 1.1 above.

Strategic Plan 1997 – 2002 (Sept. 1997)	FY 2000 Annual Performance Plan, (Feb. 1999)	FY 2001 Annual Performance Plan (Feb. 2000)
Objective 1.5: TE&S Species Recovery - <i>Populations of threatened, endangered and sensitive species will be conserved through recovery and management efforts.</i>	Objective 1.5: Protect Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Species - <i>Populations of threatened, endangered and sensitive species are conserved through recovery and management efforts.</i>	Objective 1.3: Increase the amount of habitat capable of sustaining viable populations of all native species and support desirable levels of selected species.
part of Objective 3.1: Scientific Information - <i>Better resource management decisions based on the best available scientific information and knowledge.</i>	Objective 1.6: Develop Scientific and Management Information to Support Sustainable Ecosystem Management - <i>Better ecosystem management decisions based on the best available scientific and management information.</i>	Objective 1.4: Develop Scientific and Management Information to Support Sustainable Ecosystem Management - <i>Better ecosystem management decisions based on the best available scientific and management information</i>
part of Objective 2.2: Wilderness Resource Protection and Use - <i>Naturally functioning wilderness ecosystems that provide quality wilderness recreation experiences.</i>	Objective 1.7: Protect Natural Wilderness Ecosystem Values - <i>Naturally functioning wilderness ecosystems where conditions are determined primarily by natural forces.</i>	Objective 1.5: Protect Natural Wilderness Ecosystem Values - <i>Naturally functioning wilderness ecosystems where conditions are determined primarily by natural forces</i>
Objective 2.1: Recreation - <i>Quality recreation experiences with minimal impacts to ecosystem stability and condition.</i> and part of Objective 2.2: Wilderness Resource Protection and Use - <i>Naturally functioning wilderness ecosystems that provide quality wilderness recreation experiences.</i>	Objective 2.1: Provide Quality Recreation Experiences - <i>Quality recreation experiences with minimal impacts to ecosystem stability and condition.</i>	Objective 2.1: Provide Quality Recreation Experiences - <i>Quality recreation experiences with minimal impacts to ecosystem stability and condition.</i>
Objective 2.3: Heritage Resources - <i>Protected and restored heritage resources that are available for the education and use of current and future generations.</i>	Objective 2.2: Provide for Heritage Resource Education and Use - <i>Protected and restored heritage resources that are available for the education and use of current and future generations.</i>	Combined under Objective 2.1 above
Objective 2.4: Urban Forests - <i>Improved urban environments and enhanced community livability through healthy landscapes.</i>	Objective 2.3: Support Improved Urban Environments - <i>Improved urban environments and enhanced community livability through healthy landscapes.</i>	Objective 2.2: Support Improved Urban Environments - <i>Improved urban environments and enhanced community livability through healthy landscapes.</i>
Objective 2.5: Rural Communities - <i>Economically healthy and diversified rural communities operating under strategic plans for sustainable development.</i>	Objective 2.4: Support Healthy and Diverse Rural Communities - <i>Economically healthy and diversified rural communities operating under strategic plans for sustainable development.</i>	Objective 2.3: Support Healthy and Diverse Rural Communities - <i>Economically healthy and diversified rural communities operating under strategic plans for sustainable development.</i>

Strategic Plan 1997 – 2002 (Sept. 1997)	FY 2000 Annual Performance Plan, (Feb. 1999)	FY 2001 Annual Performance Plan (Feb. 2000)
Objective 2.6: Forest Products - <i>A sustainable yield of forest products that contributes to meeting the Nation's demands and to restoring, improving or maintaining the forest ecosystem health.</i>	Objective 2.5: Provide for Sustainable Yield of Wood and Forest Products - <i>A sustainable yield of forest products that contributes to meeting the Nation's demands and to restoring, improving or maintaining forest ecosystem health.</i>	Objective 2.4: Improve the capability of the Nation's forests and rangelands to sustain desired uses, values, products and services – <i>Goods and services include such items as timber, minerals, livestock forage, oil and gas, clean water, clean air, recreation and wilderness experiences, special uses, fishing, hunting, wildlife viewing opportunities, and botanical resource values including medicinal plants and special forest products.</i>
Objective 2.7: Forage - <i>A sustainable supply of forage on suitable and capable lands for livestock and wildlife.</i>	Objective 2.6: Provide for Sustainable Grazing Use - <i>A sustainable supply of forage on suitable and capable lands for livestock and wildlife.</i>	Combined under Objective 2.4 above
Objective 2.8: Minerals - <i>Available mineral resources that comply with environmental and health standards.</i>	Objective 2.7: Support Ecologically Sound Minerals Production - <i>Available mineral resources that comply with environmental and health standards.</i>	Combined under Objective 2.4 above
part of Objective 3.1: Scientific Information - <i>Better resource management decisions based on the best available scientific information and knowledge.</i>	Objective 2.8: Develop Scientific and Management Information to Support Improved Natural Resource Management and Use - <i>Better resource management decisions based on the best available scientific and management information.</i>	Objective 2.5: Develop Scientific and Management Information to Support Improved Natural Resource Management and Use - <i>Better resource management decisions based on the best available scientific and management information.</i>
Objective 3.2: Public Safety - <i>A safer environment for the public and employees on NFS lands.</i>	Objective 2.9: Provide a Safe Environment for the Public and Employees on National Forest System Lands - <i>A safe environment for the public and employees on NFS lands.</i>	Objective 2.6: Provide a Safe Environment for the Public and Employees on National Forest System Lands - <i>A safe environment for the public and employees on NFS lands.</i>
Objective 3.3: Permit Administration - <i>Customers are satisfied with the administration of special use authorizations.</i> and Objective 3.4: Boundary and Title Management - <i>NFS resources and land title are protected through conflict-free and legally defensible boundary lines.</i>	Objective 2.10: Provide for Special Uses and Protect National Forest System Land Title - <i>NFS resources and land title are protected through conflict-free and legally defensible boundary lines, administration of special use authorizations, and provision of quality geometronics data for planning and management.</i>	Objective 2.7: Provide for Special Uses and Protect National Forest System Land Title - <i>NFS resources and land title are protected through conflict-free and legally defensible boundary lines, administration of special use authorizations, and provision of quality geometronics data for planning and management.</i>
Objective 3.5: Capital Infrastructure - <i>An efficient and effective infrastructure that supports public and administrative uses of National Forest System lands.</i>	Objective 2.11: Provide Safe Infrastructure and Access to National Forest System Lands - <i>An efficient and effective infrastructure that supports public and administrative uses of NFS lands.</i>	Objective 2.8: Provide Safe Infrastructure and Access to National Forest System Lands - <i>An efficient and effective infrastructure that supports public and administrative uses of NFS lands.</i>

<b>Strategic Plan 1997 – 2002</b> (Sept. 1997)	<b>FY 2000</b> <b>Annual Performance Plan,</b> (Feb. 1999)	<b>FY 2001</b> <b>Annual Performance Plan</b> (Feb. 2000)
<i>An innovative, people-oriented work environment and workforce that is representative of society as a whole.</i>	Management Initiative 3.1: Ensure a Productive and Diverse Workforce - <i>An innovative, people-oriented work environment and workforce that is representative of society as a whole and that services all customers equally.</i>	Management Initiative 3.1: Ensure a Productive and Diverse Workforce - <i>An innovative, people-oriented work environment and workforce that is representative of society as a whole and that services all customers equally</i>
Management Initiative 3.2: Customer Service - <i>All customers receive better service.</i>	Management Initiative 3.2: Improve Customer Service - <i>All customers receive better service.</i>	Management Initiative 3.2: Improve Customer Service - <i>All customers receive better service.</i>
Management Initiative 3.3: Information Management - <i>Integrated information systems, data structures and information management processes in place to support the agency's mission.</i>	Management Initiative 3.3: Integrate Information Systems - <i>Integrated information systems, data structures and information management processes in place to support the agency's mission.</i>	Management Initiative 3.3: Integrate Information Systems - <i>Integrated information systems, data structures and information management processes in place to support the agency's mission.</i>
Management Initiative 3.4: Financial Management - <i>A sound financial system which supports resource decisions with timely, accurate information and financial expertise.</i>	Management Initiative 3.4: Improve Financial Management and Accountability - <i>A sound financial system which supports resource decisions with timely, accurate information and financial expertise.</i>	Management Initiative 3.4: Improve Financial Management and Accountability - <i>A sound financial system which supports resource decisions with timely, accurate information and financial expertise.</i>
Management Initiative 3.5: Organization Management - <i>An effective and efficient administrative organization that supports the Forest Service mission</i>	Management Initiative 3.5: Ensure an Effective and Efficient Administrative Organization - <i>An effective and efficient administrative organization that supports the Forest Service mission.</i>	Management Initiative 3.5: Ensure an Effective and Efficient Administrative Organization - <i>An effective and efficient administrative organization that supports the Forest Service mission.</i>

## **APPENDIX E:**

### **Performance Indicators Discontinued or Modified From 1999 Performance Report**

This appendix shows how performance indicators in the 1999 Performance Report have been modified, combined, or discontinued in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Revised Final Performance Report. It shows the indicators as they are organized under the objectives in the FY 1999 Performance Report. For each objective, this appendix only shows those performance indicators that were discontinued from or have been modified in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Revised Final Performance Plan.

In most cases where indicators have been combined in or discontinued from the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan, data on the indicators will continue to be collected for other purposes.

In addition to the indicators listed below, several customer survey measures included in the FY 1999 Performance Report and previous versions of the Performance Plan are not included in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Revised Final Performance Plan. The Forest Service remains committed to ensuring a high degree of customer satisfaction. Indicators and measures were not reported here, however, because the Forest Service is still working on a systematic plan of measuring customer satisfaction and setting appropriate targets to meet this commitment.

#### **Objective 1.1: Ensure Healthy and Diverse Aquatic Ecosystems**

Three performance indicators have been discontinued:

- Abandoned Mine Land (AML) watershed initiative activities
- Bonded non-energy/energy operations administered to standard: number of operations
- Bonded non-energy/energy operations administered to standard: percent of operations

#### **Objective 1.2: Ensure Healthy and Diverse Forestlands**

Four performance indicators have been discontinued:

- Non-industrial Private Forest (NIPF) Stewardship Management Plans (number)
- Legacy Project Acquisition (number of projects)
- Statewide assessments of needs (number of states)
- Value of FEPP equipment loaned to States (millions of dollars)

Acres covered by NIPF Stewardship Management Plans and acres acquired under legacy project acquisitions are still included in the performance plan.

#### **Objective 1.3: Ensure Healthy and Diverse Rangelands**

Two performance indicators have been discontinued:

- Nonstructural range improvements completed (acres)
- Rangelands monitored for progress toward desired condition in Allotment Management Plans

#### **Objective 1.4: Respond to Hazardous Substance Sites**

Three performance indicators have been discontinued:

- Hazardous substance sites characterized
- Hazardous substance site cleanups completed
- Watershed or major abandoned mine land (AML) site cleanup actions initiated under CERCLA

#### **Objective 1.5: Protect Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive (TE&S) Species**

Two performance indicators have been combined into a single indicator. The two indicators in the FY 1999 Performance Report are:

Conservation agreements and strategies (number of sensitive aquatic and terrestrial species)  
 Approved and implemented recovery plans (number of listed aquatic and terrestrial species)

The new indicator that combines these two in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
 Conservation agreements and strategies and recovery plans (signed agreements)

**Objective 1.6: Develop Scientific and Management Information to Support Sustainable Ecosystem Management**

Three performance indicators have been combined into a single measure. The three indicators in the FY 1999 Performance Report are (all use number of assessments as their measurement unit):

Ecosystem assessments completed: Ecoregion (Domain/Division/Province) scale  
 Ecosystem assessments completed: Eco-subregion (Section/River Basin/Sub-River Basin) scale  
 Ecosystem assessments completed: Landscape/Watershed scale

The new indicator that combines these three in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
 Assessments completed (number)

A single indicator has replaced the following eleven indicators:

Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventories: Eco-subregion (Section/Subsection) scale (acres)  
 Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventories: Landscape scale (acres)  
 Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventories: Land unit scale (acres)  
 Aquatic Ecological Unit Inventories: Riverine Valley Segment (miles)  
 Aquatic Ecological Unit Inventories: Riverine Stream Reach/Channel Unit (miles)  
 Aquatic Ecological Unit Inventories: Lacustrine Lake Type Zone (acres)  
 Aquatic Ecological Unit Inventories: Lacustrine Lake Zone/Site Scale (acres)  
 Biological Inventories: Forest Resource Inventories (acres)  
 Biological Inventories: Rangeland Resource Inventories (acres)  
 Biological Inventories: Wildlife Habitat Inventories (acres)  
 Biological Inventories: TE&S Species Inventories (acres)  
 Human Dimensions Heritage Inventories (acres)

The detail contained in the eleven inventory measures will continue to be collected. However, a new indicator replaces these in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan:

Above-project inventory completed (million acres)

The following indicator from the FY 1999 Performance Plan has been combined with Technical Reports shown under objective 2.8 and assumed into a broader indicator:

Scientific papers (number)

The new indicator in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
 Number of Research Products, Tools and Technologies Transferred to Users

The following indicator has been discontinued:  
 Air Quality Related Values Inventoried/Monitored

**Objective 1.7: Protect Natural Wilderness Ecosystem Related Values**

The following indicator has been discontinued:  
 Wilderness covered by approved fire plans (acres)

**Objective 2.1: Provide Quality Recreation Experiences**

The following indicator from the FY 1999 Performance Plan has been modified and assumed into a broader indicator:

Trails reconstructed to standard (miles)

The new indicator in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
Trails maintained and improved (miles)

**Objective 2.2: Provide for Heritage Resource Education and Use**

The following indicator has been discontinued:  
Heritage sites evaluated (number of sites)

**Objective 2.3: Support Improved Urban Environments**

The following indicators have been discontinued:  
Technical assistance to communities (number)  
Training provided (million hours)  
Volunteer assistance generated (million hours)

**Objective 2.4: Support Healthy and Diverse Rural Communities**

The following indicators have been discontinued:  
Communities using locally-based measurement systems (number)  
Assistance to tribal and minority communities (number)

**Objective 2.5: Provide for Sustainable Yield of Wood and Forest Products**

The following indicator has been discontinued:  
Increased use of underutilized species (million cubic feet)

**Objective 2.6: Provide for Sustainable Grazing Use**

The following indicators have been discontinued:  
Range Structural Improvements (number)  
Allotments administered to standard (number)  
Grazing allotments analyzed and NEPA decisions signed (number)

**Objective 2.7: Support Ecologically Sound Mineral Production**

The following indicators have been combined into a single indicator (both use number of operations as their measurement unit):  
Bonded and non-bonded non-energy operations processed  
Energy operations processed

The new indicator that combines these two in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
Minerals non-energy/energy operations processed (number)

In addition, the following indicator has been added:  
Minerals non-energy/energy operations administered to standard (number)

**Objective 2.8: Develop Scientific and Management Information to Support Improved Natural Resource Management and Use**

The following indicators have been combined into a single indicator (both use number of reports):  
Land and resource management plan monitoring and evaluation  
State of the region evaluation reports

The new indicator that combines these two in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
Scheduled monitoring reports (number)

The following indicators have been combined into a single indicator (both use number of plans):  
 Land and resource management plan (LRMPs) revisions, new plans initiated  
 Land and resource management plan revisions, new plans completed

The following indicator in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan combines these two indicators:  
 Forests and grasslands initiating or completing new LRMPs or Revisions (number)

The following performance indicator has been modified:  
 Inventory field plots remeasured (percent)

The new indicator that replaces it in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
 Percent of Forest Land Covered by the Annual FIA and FHM Programs

The following indicator from the FY 1999 Performance Plan has been combined with Scientific papers shown under objective 1.6 and assumed into a broader indicator:  
 Technical Reports (number)

The new indicator in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
 Number of Research Products, Tools and Technologies Transferred to Users

**Objective 2.10: Provide for Special Uses and Protect National Forest System Land Title**

The following indicators have been discontinued:  
 Hydropower license renewals (number)  
 Revised primary base series quads maintained to standard (number)  
 Revised secondary base series quads maintained to standard (number)

The following indicator has been replaced with a broader indicator:  
 New boundary marked to standard (miles)

The new indicator in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
 Boundary line located and maintained (miles)

**Objective 2.11: Provide for Safe Infrastructure and Access to National Forest System Lands**

The following indicators have been modified in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan:  
 System roads maintained to standard (miles)  
 Investments in existing roads (miles)

They have been replaced with:  
 Road condition index rating  
 Roads without critical deferred maintenance needs (percent)  
 Roads open to all intended traffic (percent)  
 Accident frequency on roads managed and maintained for passenger cars